

PRIMARY HEADTEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF TRAINING TEACHERS FIT TO PRACTISE WITHIN CHANGING LANDSCAPES OF TEACHER TRAINING

Elaine Bernadette Barron

This is a digitised version of a dissertation submitted to the University of Bedfordshire.

It is available to view only.

This item is subject to copyright.

PRIMARY HEADTEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF TRAINING TEACHERS FIT TO PRACTISE
WITHIN CHANGING LANDSCAPES OF TEACHER TRAINING

Elaine Bernadette Barron

A thesis submitted to the University of Bedfordshire in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education

University of Bedfordshire, Institute for Research in Education

September 2015

Primary Headteachers' Perceptions of Training Teachers Fit to Practise
Within Changing Landscapes of Teacher Training

Abstract

Recent changes to the provision for teacher training have seen a move to place greater responsibility for the training of teachers with schools rather than with Higher Education Institutes. The rationale appears to be the view that this will produce the kind of teachers schools are looking to employ. However, there appears to be little research focused on the opinions of the senior management of primary schools about whether they believe this to be the case, whether they feel schools are in a good position to undertake this training, and what impact they perceive such a move will have on primary schools.

This study took a constructivist grounded theory approach to explore primary school headteachers' perceptions of how best to train primary school teachers seen by them as fit to practise and what they perceived schools could and could not provide to support this outcome.

Data were initially collected in a feasibility study exploring the views of the headteacher, the school-based mentor and the former trainee teacher in identifying their perceptions of factors which contributed to the outstanding outcome for a trainee on the Graduate Trainee Programme on the completion of his training year. Reflections on one of these factors in particular, that of the crucial role of the headteacher in enabling the successful outcome, at a time when a number of significant reforms to teacher training were being implemented,

prompted a reconsideration of the focus of the main study to an exploration of headteachers' perceptions of training teachers seen by them as fit to practise in primary schools in a changing landscape of teacher training. Twelve primary school headteachers participated in semi-structured interviews. Data were analysed utilising a constant comparison method (Strauss and Corbin, 1990; Charmaz, 2006).

Conclusions from a small scale study cannot easily be generalised. However the findings from the main study suggested the headteachers believed teachers who were fit to practise demonstrated the ability to think critically about their practice and that this attribute was under-represented in standards for teachers. In terms of training to become teachers fit to practise the headteachers supported the viewpoint of the primacy of practice but believed that practice alone was not sufficient to develop the teachers they sought to employ in their schools. In order to become critical thinkers trainee teachers needed to study the theory underpinning the teaching in schools. This study should be guided by experts, who most of the headteachers identified as academic partners, in teacher training located outside of the school. There was a measure of hostility from some of the headteachers to the idea that a teaching school could fulfil this expert role.

The headteachers used a number of synonyms to describe the teachers they were seeking but all appeared to mean teachers fit to practise in their schools. The headteachers believed they had the ability to recognise the potential to become a teacher fit to practise in applicants to teaching and they used this to identify trainee teachers who would fit their schools. With greater responsibility for teacher

training moving to schools this highlighted issues of equality of opportunity and a potentially insular approach to the training and recruitment of teachers.

According to the headteachers, schools which participated in teacher training required at least a good Ofsted grade, a climate and skilled staff to support novices and strategic leadership by the headteacher. As part of the remit of this strategic leadership the headteachers perceived it was their role to protect their schools from external pressures such as Ofsted inspections. This, they believed, gave them the autonomy to decide on their level of participation, if any, in teacher training on an annual basis.

Recommendations for further research, policy and partnerships have been made.

Author's declaration

I declare that this thesis is my own unaided work. It is being submitted in partial requirement for the degree of Doctor of Education (EdD) at the University of Bedfordshire.

It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other University.

Name of Candidate: Elaine Bernadette Barron

Signature: *Elaine Barron*

Date: 10.09.2015

Dedication

In memory of members of the Barron, Toland, Kieran and McEvoy families

Agus beidh gach a mar a bhí sé roimh

List of Contents

Abstract	ii
Author's declaration	v
Dedication	vi
List of contents	vii
List of tables	x
Acknowledgments	xi
List of abbreviations	xii
Chapter One: Introduction	1
Context	4
Personal rationale	6
Research process	7
Thesis structure	10
Chapter Two: Literature Review	12
Introduction	12
Teacher training 1700 to 1980	12
1980 to 2010	26
2010 onward	32
Summary	38
How best to train teachers	39
What makes a teacher fit to practise?	39
Standards and QTS	51
Theory and practice	59
Summary	67
Teacher training in schools	68
Partnership	72
Mentoring of trainees	75
Pressures on schools	81
Summary	83
Chapter summary	84
Chapter Three: Methodology	86
Introduction	86
The pilot study	88
Case study	89
Sampling	90
Data collection	91
Data analysis	92
Ethics	93
Evaluation of pilot study methodology	94
The role of the pilot study	95
The main study	96
The nature of the research	96
Methodology of main study	100
Grounded theory	101
Reflexivity	108
Sampling	113
Ethics	116
Interviews	117
Interview schedule	120
Interview process	121
Data analysis	123
Initial coding	125
Focused coding	127
Theoretical coding	129

Presentation of findings	131
Trustworthiness	133
Conclusion	138
Chapter Four: Pilot Study Summary and links to Main Study	139
Chapter Five: Main Study Findings	144
Introduction	144
Attributes of the headteachers	145
‘Beyond the standards’	151
Respondents’ identification of the attributes of teachers fit to practise	156
Critical thinking	159
Commitment	160
Collaboration	160
Courage	161
Being industrious and orderly	161
Being persuasive	161
Being receptive	162
Being knowledgeable	162
Comparison to Teachers’ Standards and Ofsted criteria	162
Attributes looked for in potential teachers	168
Reflection	170
‘I know it when I see it’	172
Knowing it when I see it	172
Trainee teachers – the right person, the person who fits	173
Reflection	174
‘A journey to get them to where it is you want them to be’	175
Practice	179
Theory	182
Time	185
Commitment	185
Location of responsibilities for practice and theory	186
Preferred routes into primary teacher training	189
Reflection	192
‘If you’ve said they can learn how to do their job at your school, then you have to give them the opportunity to succeed and make sure this happens’	192
School grading	194
Willingness and responsibility to participate in teacher training	195
Grow your own teachers	196
Ethos or climate	197
Headteacher leadership	197
School mentors	199
Role of other staff	201
Factors which impact negatively on schools’ ability to participate in teacher training	202
External pressure on schools	202
Schools taking on more responsibility for teacher training	204
Perceptions of teaching as a career	205
Reflection	206
Responses from the most experienced headteachers	207
Teachers fit to practise	208
Teacher training	211
The role of the school in teacher training	213
Reflection	216
Chapter Six: Discussion	218
Introduction	218
‘Beyond the standards’	219
Identification of teachers fit to teach primary age children	219

Comparisons of headteachers' identifications against the Teachers' Standards and the Ofsted criteria	223
'I know it when I see it'	229
Implications for recruitment	230
'A journey to get them to where it is you want them to be'	239
Current routes into teaching	239
Practising teaching – the role of practice	242
Studying teaching – the role of theory	246
Location for the practise and study of teaching	248
Preferred routes into teaching	254
Growing your own teachers	259
'If you've said they can learn how to do their job at your school, then you have to give them the opportunity to succeed and make sure this happens'	262
School grading	262
School climate	268
The role of the headteacher	272
The role of the school-based mentor	274
The role of other staff	279
External pressures	281
Conclusion	287
Chapter Seven: Personal Reflection and Evaluation of the Study	289
Introduction	289
Reflexivity	289
Reflections on the pilot	290
Refocusing the research aims	291
Personal experience and credibility as the researcher	292
Constraints of research design and implementation	292
Strengths of research design and implementation	293
Conclusion	294
Chapter Eight: Conclusion	295
Introduction	295
Contribution to knowledge	295
Focus on voices of those with experience	296
Issues related to supporting future trainee teachers	297
Achievement of objectives	299
Recommendations	307
Final summary and conclusion	310
Appendices	312
Appendix A: Ofsted grading criteria for trainee teachers 2008-11	313
Appendix B: Interview questions for pilot study	323
Appendix C: Ethical approval	325
Appendix D: Participant information sheet	329
Appendix E: Questions for main study interview (pilot version)	332
Appendix F: Questions for main study interview	333
References	334

List of Tables

Table 2.1 Kennedy's (2006) hypothesis on teacher quality	41
Table 2.2 Sockett's (2009) descriptions	43
Table 2.3 Characteristics of professionalism (Hay-McBer/DfEE, 200)	48
Table 2.4 Characteristics of thinking (Hay-McBer/DfEE, 200)	48
Table 2.5 Characteristics of planning and expectations (Hay-McBer/DfEE, 200)	49
Table 2.6 Characteristics of leading (Hay-McBer/DfEE, 200)	49
Table 2.7 Characteristics of relating to others (Hay-McBer/DfEE, 200)	50
Table 3.1 The qualitative characteristics of the main research study	100
Table 3.2 Summary of the main research design	105
Table 3.3 Using reflexivity to identify areas of potential researcher bias	111
Table 3.4 Three areas of focus identified as part of the theoretical coding stage	130
Table 3.5 Evidence to match Charmaz's (2006) trustworthy category of credibility	135
Table 3.6 Evidence to match Charmaz's (2006) trustworthy category of originality	136
Table 3.7 Evidence to match Charmaz's (2006) trustworthy category of resonance	137
Table 3.8 Evidence to match Charmaz's (2006) trustworthy category of usefulness	137
Table 4.1 Summary of respondents' perceptions of the role of the headteacher	140
Table 4.2 Summary of the headteacher's perceptions of the role of key participants	141
Table 5.1 Links between the theoretical codes which emerged from the analysis of data and the research objectives	144
Table 5.2 Background information on the participants and their schools	148
Table 5.3 Length of respondents' ITT experience matched to key events impacting on ITT since 1984	150
Table 5.4 An analysis of the Teachers' Standards and the Ofsted grading criteria	154
Table 5.5 Headteachers' identification of the attributes of teachers fit to practise	158
Table 5.6 An analysis of the Teachers' Standards and the Ofsted criteria matched to the headteachers' descriptions of teachers fit to practise	164
Table 5.7 Headteachers' descriptions of the attributes of teachers fit to practise matched to the Teachers' Standards	165
Table 5.8 Headteachers' descriptions of the attributes of teachers fit to practise matched to the Ofsted grading criteria	166
Table 5.9 Headteachers' identification of the advantages of routes into teaching against their own route into teaching	177
Table 5.10 Headteachers' identification of the disadvantages of routes into teaching against their own route into teaching	178
Table 5.11 Headteachers' perceptions of the importance of practice for trainee teachers against their own route into teaching	180
Table 5.12 Headteachers' perceptions of theory for trainee teachers against their own route into teaching	183
Table 5.13 Headteachers' choice(s) of route(s) into teaching against their own route into teaching	189
Table 5.14 Headteachers' perceptions of factors in school required to give trainee teachers the opportunity to succeed against their own route into teaching	193
Table 5.15 Headteachers' perceptions of factors which impact negatively on schools' participation in ITT against their own route into teaching	202

Acknowledgements

My grateful thanks go to Professor Janice Wearmouth for her guidance, patience, encouragement and support. Without this, I would not have been able to complete the study.

My thanks to Dr Erik Blair for his early encouragement and to Professor Patrick Carmichael for his insightful comments.

I would like to thank my colleagues for their support. I am grateful to the headteachers who willingly gave of their time, their experiences and their views to make this research study possible.

List of Abbreviations

BEd	Bachelor of Education
BERA	British Education Research Association
DES	Department for Education and Science
DfE	Department for Education
DfES	Department for Education and Skills
HEI	Higher Education Institute
HMI	Her Majesty's Inspector [of schools]
GTP	Graduate Trainee Programme
NCTL	National College for Teaching and Leadership
NQT	Newly Qualified Teacher
Ofsted	Office for Standards in Education
PGCE	Postgraduate Certificate in Education
QTS	Qualified Teacher Status
SCITT	School-centred Initial Teacher Training
SDS	School Direct Salaried
SDUS	School Direct Unsalaries
TA	Teaching Agency
TDA	Training and Development Agency
TTA	Teacher Training Agency

Chapter One: Introduction

There has been a debate about how teachers should be trained to be fit to practise for over three hundred years. In 1707 the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (SPCK) published a manual entitled *The Christian Schoolmaster* which was intended to guide the provision and work of teachers in the newly formed charity schools for the poor of English church parishes (Dent, 1977). This guide advised the people managing these schools to identify promising older boys to become teacher-pupils and ‘...if they showed the genius for teaching, be apprenticed so that they might gain the art of teaching school on the old master’s methods’ (SPCK minutes, 15th November 1715 in Jones, 1938:101). In a speech to the annual National College Conference in 2012 the Secretary of State for Education, Michael Gove, announced that, in reforms to teacher training, ‘...new recruits will learn and train in schools, working with experienced teachers and putting their lessons into practice from day one’ (DfE, 2012: Online). This suggests that teacher training has come full circle with the implication that we just need to identify in prospective teachers the genius for teaching and then apprentice them to a master where they can learn their craft. This is a viewpoint which identifies that schools have everything in place to train teachers who are fit to practise and that doing this can be viewed an extension of what schools already do.

In 2014 Charlie Taylor, head of the National College of Teaching and Leadership, declared that:

‘I have set September 2016 as the target date for there to be an irrevocable shift from the centre to schools....and by September 2016 teaching schools and the best schools and academy chains will be leading teacher training.’

(Taylor, 2014: Online)

Statistics published in 2014 revealed Higher Education Institutes (HEIs) to be the predominant trainers of teachers in 2012, with figures showing they had an eighty per-cent share of the training market. However, this share was falling quite rapidly and was predicted to be around fifty-one per-cent in the academic year 2015-16 (UUK, 2014). This is a significant change over a short period of time and it suggests that Charlie Taylor’s target may be realised if it is schools that are taking up the training places removed from the HEIs.

What is missing in this debate is the voice from schools, and in particular leaders of those schools, on what they are seeking in terms of the training of teachers they perceive are fit to practise in their schools and how best they perceive this may be achieved in a teacher training system. Given the changing landscape of teacher training this research study sought to investigate the perceptions of leaders of primary schools in how best teachers could be trained in order to ensure they were fit to practise in primary schools. The study also sought to explore the impact on schools the leaders perceived would result from such policy changes.

Government policy statements contained in The Case for Change (DfE, 2010a: Online) and Training the Next Generation of Outstanding Teachers (DfE, 2011a: Online) have made clear the ideological focus on promoting the craft of teaching in teacher training programmes, what The Cause for Change describes as ‘... a sharper focus on the essentials of teaching’ (DfE, 2010: Online). To achieve this focus,

according to the implementation plan for Training the Next Generation of Outstanding Teachers, teacher training will be reformed to create:

‘...a new system, “school direct”. The system allows schools to control access to funding for ITT and therefore become closely involved in the selection and training of trainees who are expected to go on to work in the school. It also offers more trainees the opportunity to choose training that is linked to a particular school.’

(DfE, 2011b: Online)

This reinforces the view that schools are the natural place to train teachers and that schools should want to, and be keen to, take on this responsibility. It also suggests this will provide the schools with teachers to employ – teachers who they have trained in their craft, in their image, who will thus be fit to practise. Taylor noted these will be the best schools, a view shared by Michael Wilshaw, Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector of Schools and the head of the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted), who had criticised teacher training led by HEIs for placing trainee teachers in schools which left trainees having no idea of ‘...what good looked like’ because they had been sent to schools that did not employ ‘...good practice’ (Wilshaw, 2014: Online). These ‘best’ schools and this ‘good’ practice, as viewed by Taylor and Wilshaw, are almost certainly judged though grades received in Ofsted inspections. Thus the school direct system is one where schools who meet government measurements are encouraged to train teachers in the craft of teaching (which is in a form which meets the measurements) and to then be employed in these schools as qualified teachers. This appears to be a teacher training system underpinned by the view that teachers fit to practise are those who are willing to accept good practice as that identified by Ofsted and compliant enough to take this on as their

own practice. The pilot and the main study for this research focused on exploring the perceptions of leaders in primary schools on how best trainee teachers might be prepared for their jobs as teachers. This chapter will now consider the context for the research. This will be followed by an overview of the research process to include discussion of the changes made after the pilot study to revise the focus of the main study. The revised research aim and objectives will be stated. The chapter concludes with an explanation of the structure of the thesis.

Context

Teacher training in England is controlled by central government and thus subject to reform to reflect the dominant ideology of the time. The last five years have seen significant reforms focused on leadership of teacher training moving from Higher Education Institutes (HEIs) to schools. Whilst training by means of the Bachelor of Education degree (BEd) is the route taken by most students intending to become primary school teachers, this is likely to reduce as one year routes such as the Post Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) and the School Direct Salaried (SDS) and the School Direct Unsalaries (SDUS) are the routes on offer from schools, working with their preferred partners in teacher training, taking the lead. Behind the reforms is the ideology that teaching is a craft and thus best learned in the place where the craft can be observed and practised under the direction of its masters. This suggests teachers in training need to practise their craft in order to attain mastery. But others believe learning teaching also requires the study of theoretical perspectives in order to understand and be able to apply practice in the range of situations and contexts that teachers will experience in their working lives. The

debate about the roles of practice and theory in the training of teachers has been taking place since the inception of teacher training, but it is one which is no nearer to resolution and thus ripe for reform by prevailing governments.

The current reforms come at a time when concerns are growing about the supply of teachers, with a poll in the Times Educational Supplement suggesting one in three schools reporting difficulties in recruiting teachers (Ward, 2015). Recruitment to teacher training is also a concern with targets going unmet and this has been a particular issue with School Direct recruitment (Morrison, 2014). The government believed giving schools the responsibility to train teachers would attract more applicants but this has not, as yet, been realised. In 2013-14 only sixty-one per-cent of the allocated School Direct places were filled, with seventy-four per-cent being filled in 2014-15 (Ward, 2015). In addition the rate for new teachers leaving the profession is a concern with Foster (2016:6), in a briefing paper for the library of the House of Commons, recording that ‘...19% of newly qualified entrants to the sector in 2012 were not recorded as working in the state sector two years later. The five year out-of-service rate for 2010 entrants was 28%, the ten year rate for 2005 entrants was 38%’.

According to Stewart (2015) a teacher crisis is approaching but this has been denied by the government, with the Minister of State for Schools, Nick Gibb, noting that primary training target numbers had been met this year and that secondary shortages were ‘...not a new phenomenon’ (DfE, 2015: Online). Not everyone agrees with the minister and concerns about the impact of poor recruitment to teacher training places in the past few years and the rate at which teachers leave

the profession have contributed to the anxiety about teacher shortages (Ward, 2015; Stewart, 2015; Boffey, 2015; and Bousted, 2015).

These concerns are linked to the focus of this research study as, in exploring primary headteachers' perceptions of the role of schools in training teachers in a changing landscape, consideration must be given to how leaders will take the lead in recruiting potential teachers. It is in primary school headteachers' interests to have available a consistent supply of qualified teachers who are fit to practise for selection to work in their schools. Any teacher shortage will have a direct impact on headteachers and their schools.

Personal rationale

I undertook my teacher training in England during the 1970s. Since then I have worked in primary schools as a class teacher, a deputy headteacher and headteacher. In all these roles I have participated at some level in teacher training; as a class teacher with a trainee assigned to the class; as a mentor to trainee teachers; and in roles requiring me to take a strategic lead on teacher training in the school. More recently I have worked as an academic in HEI and part of my role has involved supporting trainee teachers on the Graduate Teacher Programme (GTP) and the School Direct Salaried (SDS) route. This has given me a strong professional interest in the training of primary school teachers and a focus for my research.

Research process

My initial research focus was to explore what an outstandingly successful outcome might look like on the Graduate Teacher Programme (GTP). This arose from my experience in working as a visiting tutor supporting trainees on the GTP. Over a number of years I observed that the outcomes for trainees taking this 'on the job' route were dependent on the provision in the school and that this provision differed widely even though the teacher training provider was the same. I perceived that the impact of the school on a trainee's achievement and attainment appeared to be greater than the impact of the provider. There seemed to be a community of practice in the school in which the trainee, as the novice, was supported and guided by more experienced practitioners (Wenger, 1998). I was keen to explore this further and decided that the first step would be to investigate how a community in a school contributed to a trainee on the GTP gaining Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) and achieving a grade of outstanding as measured by the Ofsted grading criteria for trainee teachers (Ofsted, 2009) (Appendix A). To do this I undertook a retrospective case study of a former GTP trainee, who has been judged outstanding, in the year after he completed his training year. I explored the perceptions of the trainee, the school-based mentor and the headteacher of the role the school community played in the outcome for the trainee. The overarching aim of this research was to explore the perceptions of key members of staff on the role a school community could play in training teachers on the GTP programme to be the best teachers they could be. Discussions with colleagues identified a small number of potential schools and I approached the headteacher of one such school, selected because it met the

criteria and it was a school in which I had not supported trainee teachers and thus with which I had no previous relationship. The headteacher was interested in the research and agreed to approach the former trainee who was then employed as a newly qualified teacher in the school and the school-based tutor who had supported him during his training year. All were willing to participate in the research and this became the pilot study.

The pilot study took an interpretative approach using grounded theory in order to explore the perceptions of the headteacher, the school-based mentor and the former trainee of the role played by the school community in the successful outcome for the trainee. Data were gathered using three sets of semi-structured interviews, with each participant being interviewed on each occasion. Data collection and analysis were recursive, allowing for initial data findings to be followed up in subsequent interviews. One of the main conclusions of the pilot study was that the role of the headteacher was crucial in creating a climate conducive to facilitating the development of the outstanding practice demonstrated by the trainee.

The period following the completion of the pilot study coincided with the announcement of a number of proposed reforms to teacher training to include *The Case for Change* (DfE, 2010a) and *Training the Next Generation of Outstanding Teachers* (DfE, 2011). These were supported in media statements and public appearances by Michael Gove and Michael Wilshaw. This engendered discussions about the roles of schools in teacher training amongst colleagues and on occasions when I found myself at meetings where there were a number of primary school

headteachers. Some of these discussions included comments made by headteachers that they felt their views on teacher training reforms had not been sought. I recall one headteacher commenting on a remark made by Michael Gove that headteachers across the country had been urging him to allow them to run teacher training, with the headteacher declaring ‘...Well nobody asked me’. These discussions, along with the outcomes of the pilot study prompted me to reconsider my plans for the main study. Reflecting back on the pilot study I looked again at the role played by the headteacher in the successful outcome for the trainee and identified it as crucial to the success – the actions of the headteacher allowed the school-based mentor to carry to her role to support the trainee and created a climate where the trainee felt supported and valued. Reflecting on this and considering the discussions I had been having with headteachers on the reforms to teacher training I was keen to explore the perceptions of primary school headteachers on teacher training – and to do this, as one headteacher suggested Michael Gove had not, by asking them. The overarching aim for the main study therefore became: to explore the perceptions of primary headteachers of the training of teachers that they saw as fit to teach primary aged children in the context of a changing landscape of teacher education

The research objectives were:

- a. To explore primary school headteachers’ views of what constituted the attributes of the teachers they needed to;
 - ensure the quality of education in their schools
 - and that they thought initial teacher education should be producing
- b. To compare the headteachers’ identification of teachers fit to teach primary age children to the Teachers’ Standards (DfE, 2011b) which trainee teachers

must meet to be awarded QTS and to the Ofsted grading criteria for trainee teachers (Ofsted, 2009) which were in use at the time

- c. To explore the criteria primary school headteachers used to identify potential teachers
- d. To explore the headteachers' views of the routes into teaching they believed were best suited to the development of primary teachers during initial teacher education
- e. To explore the headteachers' perceptions of the role that schools in the training of teachers fit to teach primary age children
- f. To explore the headteachers' perceptions of aspects of training that trainee teachers might require to become fit to teach primary age children which they believed schools could not undertake
- g. To explore the headteachers' views of factors which might impact on a school's participation in teacher training

Thesis structure

Chapter Two is the literature review which commences with a consideration of the history of teacher training to contextualise the ongoing debate about how best teachers should be trained. This section concludes with a review of current teacher training reforms to include how these are supported in speeches by their main proponents, Michael Gove, Michael Wilshaw and Charlie Taylor. A review of how literature identifies good and outstanding teachers, that is those fit to practise, is undertaken and this is contrasted to the use of the Teachers' Standards (DfE, 2011b) and the Ofsted grading criteria for trainee teachers (Ofsted, 2009). Next a review of the current provision for teacher training where schools are predominantly charged with providing opportunities for trainees to practise teaching and where other bodies, most usually HEIs, are responsible for providing the theoretical study of teaching. The chapter ends with a detailed focus on what provision might be needed in schools to support teacher training.

The methodology section in Chapter Three outlines the epistemological and ontological approaches taken to the research. The methodology is discussed to include ethical considerations, sampling, data collection, data analysis and establishing the trustworthiness of the research. A section on reflexivity is included in this chapter as this was a stance taken throughout the research.

Chapter Four presents a brief overview and discussion of the key findings of the pilot study concluding with a short evaluation to highlight how the focus of the research changed for the main study. Chapter Five presents the findings from the main study and this is followed by the discussion in Chapter Six. Chapter Seven contains an evaluation of the research study which considers the strengths and constraints of the study. This chapter includes a personal reflection on the research process. Chapter Eight concludes the study by summarising the study and making recommendations for practice and future research. This chapter includes a discussion of how this thesis contributes to knowledge and the existing evidence base.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Introduction

In exploring primary school headteachers' perceptions of training teachers fit to practise it is important to consider the current policies in initial teacher training in order to understand the realities and the potential of the involvement of schools. These policies need to be seen in the context of the changes in educational provision over the years. This review of literature will therefore begin with a brief history of teacher training in England between 1700 and 1980. This is followed by a review of the period between 1980 and 2010 where provision for education in England, including that for teacher training, took on an increasingly centralised and market-led approach. Current government policy is considered in the section looking at policy from 2010 onwards. The nature of the changing relationships between teacher training providers and schools will be explored to include a discussion of the roles of theory and practice in teacher training, examining literature on the types of knowledge sets trainee teachers require. This chapter concludes with a consideration of what some researchers consider is required in schools to support teacher training in terms of the climate and resources for training, and the roles of staff such as headteachers, school-based mentors, those who hold the mantle of experts in specified areas and factors which may impact on schools' participation in teacher training.

Teacher training 1700 to 1980

A consideration of the past three hundred years of teacher training in England reveals a recurring debate about how best to identify and to train primary school

teachers (initially called elementary school teachers). It evidences that concerns about the balance of theoretical and practical training required for teachers, and where best trainee teachers might learn these, have been a source of debate for over three hundred years. In reviewing the history of teacher training it is tempting to consider that not much changes and that it is the same debate which reoccurs time and time again. If teachers are trained predominantly in schools they are found wanting and reform is sought to provide them with training outside of the school. If teachers are trained predominantly in institutions outside of schools they are found wanting and reform is sought to place them inside schools. That this debate is continues to be at the heart of teacher training provision today suggests there is still much to learn about the preparation of teachers and hints at the fact that this may be a matter upon which agreement can never been found because competing ideologies prevail.

To put this ongoing debate into context this review begins with consideration of what has been recorded about the early training of teachers. In outlining the history of education in this section I have drawn heavily on two books. The first was originally published in 1933, although the third edition published in 1977 was used for this review, and is called 'The Training of Teachers in England and Wales in the Nineteenth Century' by R. W. Rich. The second was published in 1977 by Professor Harold Dent (1894-1995) and is called 'The Training of Teachers in England and Wales 1800-1975'. These two books appeared to be among the few publications covering this period of teacher training.

The early part of the eighteenth century reflects a view of teacher training as charity schools were emerging, well before the introduction of universal education. The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge was concerned with the need for its apprentice teachers to have some form of training, which it attempted to provide through model schools which teachers could visit to observe good practice – early versions of teaching schools perhaps. At the beginning of the nineteenth century Joseph Lancaster, a member of the Society of Friends (Quakers) who were involved in charity schools, identified the need for pupil-teachers, then called monitors, to be trained in organisation, administration, curriculum, methodology, examination, discipline and welfare – a list that does not look out of place in today’s training. And there is a rather startling parallel between the views of Gove, speaking in 2012, and those of Lancaster, writing in 1808, on how best to train teachers:

‘It is by attending school, seeing what is going on there, and taking a share in the office of tuition, that teachers are to be formed, and not by lectures and abstract instructions.’

(Lancaster, 1808: Appendix, *Improvements in Education* cited in Rich, 1977)

Lancaster’s early training approach developed into the Teacher’s Certificate and the establishment of the first teacher training college, Borough Road, in London in 1808. This was followed by a small number of other training establishments, usually as part of a school, to include Baldwin Gardens and Barrington School (Rich, 1972). The training at Baldwin Gardens, in common with the other training institutions, was according to Rich (1972:11):

‘...largely a matter of learning by doing. When some masteryhad been manifested, the pupil was placed either as “teacher” (or monitor) or

assistant in a class, starting at the bottom in the “sand class” and working up through the school in a period of six to eight weeks.’

The period 1800-1860 marked the development of the state system of education (Gillard, 2011). By 1813 there was more of an emphasis on teacher preparation than previously. Prospective teachers had to pass an examination before being admitted to training in response to concerns about their basic skills, providing an early example of the professional tests which have to be passed by today’s student teachers. A year later the content of the training syllabus for teachers was formalised as English grammar used appropriately in speaking and writing, handwriting, arithmetic, geography, history and any other useful branches of knowledge if time permitted. Throughout the nineteenth century more teacher training colleges were established, initially by religious bodies but increasingly by the state following the creation in 1834 of the Select Committee of the House of Commons for Education. This resulted in a wider involvement of people, beyond religious bodies, in the promotion of popular education. Stephens (1985:4) noted that the Select Committee was established partly in response to the fact that early government grants to schools were difficult to control because the:

‘Money being paid directly to promoters of schools following recommendation by the National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the principles of the Established Church or the British and Foreign School Society....relied only on the most limited guidance and consequently was able to achieve only the most limited control over the way these public funds were spent.’

As part of its mission to bring greater accountability to how state funds were used the Select Committee proposed to make a grant to fund four teacher training institutions, to be known as ‘Normal Schools’ in London, Exeter, Lancaster and York. The religious bodies who were, at that time, largely running schools and early forms

of teacher training were quick to protest the move, mainly directed at concerns about religious influence, and were powerful enough to have the proposal cancelled. However the recently appointed Secretary of the Committee of Council on Education, Dr John Phillips Kay (who was later, and more commonly, known as Sir John Kay-Shuttleworth) was determined to pursue the idea behind Normal Schools and to secure government funding to improve the training of teachers.

In 1838 Kay-Shuttleworth founded Norwood Poor Law School and he appointed pupil teachers selected by means of their ‘...zeal, attainment and gentleness of deposition’ (Pollard, 1956:206, cited in Dent, 1977). These pupil teachers, and others in similar schools, were apprenticed to carefully chosen headteachers, taught their own class during the day, received instruction from the headteachers outside of their teaching day and were inspected annually by Her Majesty’s Inspectors (HMI). The pupil teachers were paid a salary (unlike earlier monitor teachers) and the headteacher would receive a remuneration conditional upon the pupil teacher ‘...at HMI’s annual examination securing a certificate of good character and satisfactory progress’ (Dent, 1977:19). This creates some interesting parallels to the current School Direct Salaried (SDS) route. Kay-Shuttleworth believed gaining the pupil teacher certificate was a first step towards further training and the award of a Teacher’s Certificate. Writing in 1877 Kay-Shuttleworth recalled his aim to be to ‘...promote the building of Training Colleges in which pupil teachers might complete their education’ (Smith, 1923:91, cited in Rich, 1977).

In 1840 Kay-Shuttleworth established the first of these Training Colleges at Battersea which was run along the lines proposed for ‘Normal Schools’ and with an

aim for pupil-teachers to undertake the further training required to become certified teachers, what Rich (1977:65) noted as being ‘...concerned with education as well as professional training’. Initially privately funded, Kay-Shuttleworth managed to gain some government grants to support the training but had to transfer the college to the religious body, the National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor, for it to continue in terms of financial viability. The Battersea College was, however, the model at the time for other training colleges which the National Society established around the country and Smith (1923:105) noted that these became places where ‘...methods of training teachers were tested and modified’. One of the aims of the colleges was to provide a one year certified training course for new entrants to teaching training; these were initially mature young men, aged between twenty and thirty. The main aim, however, was the further training for pupil- teachers in order that they could obtain a Teacher’s Certificate after serving a seven year apprenticeship. However, there was no requirement, and the length of the apprenticeship provided little incentive, at this stage for pupil-teachers to undertake any further training and so many chose not to do so.

This led, by the later years of the nineteenth century, to a two-tier system whereby there were certificated teachers and there were pupil-teachers, known as uncertified teachers. With the wide number of religious schools established and the provision of national schools by the government in places where religious schools were not present, the issue of the quality of education in elementary schools came under the scrutiny of the government by means of a Royal Commission in 1861.

This Commission concluded that teachers required training beyond that available to uncertified teachers and suggested reforms which were linked to the recommendation that ‘...financial aid should in future be dependent on the outcome of a rigorous examination of the levels of attainment of individual pupils in basic subjects’ (Stevens, 1955). The 1861 version of Year Six Standards Assessment Tests (SATs) it would appear. The Royal Commission brought the recently formed Education Department of the government extensive control over elementary schools detailed, notes Stevens (1985:5), in the Department’s:

‘...annual minutes and reports [which] contain a vast array of data on almost every aspect of public schooling in Great Britain.’

The focus on pupil attainment also brought a focus on the teachers teaching the pupils, which led to the creation of colleges, initially called ‘day colleges’ but later to also include residential colleges, where students could study over two years to become teachers (Dent, 1977:29). Scholarships were introduced to provide grants for those studying for their teaching certificate and every school with over fifty pupils was expected to have pupil-teachers in training for their certificate; failure to do this risked a cut in the grant paid to the school. The conditions of service of the pupil-teacher were, however, freed from any central control and made directly between the pupil-teacher and the manager of the school. At the end of the apprenticeship the pupil-teacher could become an assistant teacher in a school or continue towards certification.

In order to ensure what it perceived to be the accountability of institutions receiving public money in the form of grants, the Education Department took a

number of actions to exert control over the certification of teachers; the most significant of these to teacher training were to pay grants to teacher training colleges retrospectively after the teachers had been awarded their certificate and to cap the number of student teachers a college could recruit (Rich, 1977). This, and other reductions by the Education Department in grants to student teachers, limited opportunities for pupil-teachers and saw a rapid decline in the number of pupil-teachers applying to teaching colleges between 1860 and 1866. Rich (1977) attributed this to the Education Committee adopting a marketplace approach of supply and demand, with certified teachers having to prove to schools that they were worth the additional costs of their salary over the cost of employing a pupil-teacher. Rich (1977:187) noted:

‘Unfortunately free competition may favour the cheapest instead of the best, and in a small school an untrained teacher might prove a better business proposition for the managers than a trained teacher, and many managers were forced now to look at the question of staffing mainly from this standpoint.’

Minutes from the Education Department in 1866 show one manager of a training college warning that:

‘The whole pupil teacher system is now in danger of being upset, and with it that of training schools; and if you upset those two things you bring back education to the state in which it was in 25 years ago, and all the labour which has been undergone, and the four millions of money which has been expended on that office during the last quarter of a century will be rendered useless.

(Committee of Council, *Report*, 1865-66:412 cited in Rich, 1977)

The reforms of teacher training also led to concerns about the supply of teachers, with minutes from 1867 showing one inspector of schools reporting on the reforms to the certification of teachers:

As the keystone of the training system, I hope it will be maintained, but I cannot conceal from myself that the failure in the supply of trained masters is a very great blow to it; for the increasing difficulty of finding suitable persons to fill vacancies in schools will add to the number who are opposed to the condition of the certificate.'

(Committee of Council, *Report*, 1866-67:394 cited in Rich, 1977)

These concerns were partially addressed by changes to the grant system to training colleges but it was the consequences of the Education Act of 1870, and subsequent acts of 1874 and 1877, which brought some stability to teacher training in the final part of the nineteenth century. The 1870 Act brought significant central control of schools to the Education Committee to include the introduction of compulsory attendance at school for children aged between five and thirteen, a move which necessitated the provision of a sufficient number for teachers. In the years following the 1870 Act schools were restricted, at first, to no more than three pupil-teachers for every certified teacher and in 1880 this was reduced to no more than two pupil-teachers. Any prospective student who passed the entrance examination and was accepted at training college was eligible for a grant, making training to be a teacher a more attractive proposition, with the likelihood of employment at the end of training greatly increased. In addition, if approved by one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of School, any uncertified school master over the age of thirty-five, or schoolmistress over the age of thirty, was granted full certification, thus alleviating concerns about a shortage of teachers.

This secured, for the time being, the role of the teacher training college but concerns were expressed that the route to certification for teachers was dominated by the need to ensure pupils passed their examinations in the basic subjects. This meant that teacher training was focused on methods to achieve this. A report to the Committee to Council by one of Her Majesty's Inspectors noted:

'The characteristic weakness of certificated teachers (a most useful and efficient body) seems to me to be their fanatical belief in machinery. So long as their methods are irreproachable, and their arrangements modelled on the newest and most approved patterns, they have a comfortable assurance that all must go well; not realising until perhaps some serious breakdown comes to enlighten them, that instruction may be very scientifically organised and yet fail to reach and impress the scholars' minds; in a word, that a thing may be taught very well and yet ill learnt.'

(Committee of Council, Report, 1869-70:466, cited in Rich, 1977)

Nearly one hundred and fifty years later the term 'machinery' brings forward reflections on initiatives such as the literacy hour, the numeracy hour and a plethora of other such government endorsed approaches. Teacher training providers are judged by today's Her Majesty's Inspectors on how well trainee teachers are prepared to teach, or perhaps to deliver, synthetic phonics; which might be describes as the 'machinery' to teach early reading.

Indeed other parallels can be drawn to comments by the current incumbent of the post of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Schools who criticised teacher training providers for not instructing trainee teachers in how to dress suitably for working in schools (Wilshaw, 2014). In 1871 women who wished to begin teacher training were informed:

'The Ladies' Committee wish it to be distinctly understood by all candidates for admission that they consider neatness and plainness of dress incumbent

on those who undertake the instruction and training of the young; and it is the express wish of the Committee that no flowers, ornaments, or other finery should be worn.'

(British and Foreign School Society, *Annual Report*, 1871:6, cited in Rich, 1977)

The content and structure of the training programmes of the colleges at the time came in for criticism in a list of concerns which would not seem out of place in a speech by Michael Gove:

'There was a need for a supply of better candidates. The training college students were not so good at teaching as they should be, owing to the artificiality of the conditions under which they practised, but they improved greatly when they started work in the schools as full-blown teachers. There was too much "spoon-feeding" of students.'

(Rich, 1977:215)

During this time there was an ongoing debate about whether the training undertaken at these colleges was academic or professional, and what it was that was most appropriate to the training of teachers. Successful trainees were awarded a certificate and not a degree at the completion of their studies – the prevailing idea remaining that the Teacher's Certificate was a professional qualification. This was a trend which continued for the first part of the twentieth century with most teacher training colleges awarding certificates but with a few making links to universities and offering a degree and a certificate. The government approach favoured the certificate route for teachers and a number of initiatives, following the First World War, allowed for some teachers to be trained in one year to increase the number of teachers available to teach in schools. There remained, however, the debate about how best to train teachers. At this point, believed Keating (2010:9), the debate was:

‘...about the importance of academic versus professional training and how far – especially for elementary teachers – training should be child-centred rather than subject-centred. There was now a substantial body of academic literature on child development and learning; should aspirant teachers concentrate on this or was expertise in their subject and training in classroom management more important?’

Keating (2010:10) continued to note this debate is as current today with concerns being ‘...Governments are uninterested in pedagogic theories and simply want technicians who can produce good exam results’.

It was the McNair Report in 1944 which brought about major reforms to teacher training to include the introduction of the status of Qualified Teacher. The report declared two years training to be insufficient, that teacher training colleges lacked a coherent approach to training and that universities should work in partnership with training colleges to secure an effective training service. The McNair recommendations for training were:

(a) that the normal period of education and training provided by area training authorities for those entering upon preparation for the teaching profession at about 18 years of age should be three years; and that the period of training for graduates should be one year;

(b) that suitably qualified persons other than graduates should be eligible for a one-year course of training; and

(e) that courses of training, varied in duration, should be provided to meet the needs of others whose attainments and experience, however obtained, justify their entering upon a course of training.

(The McNair Report, 1944: Paragraph 208)

In addition universities were to take a prominent role in teacher training to include working in partnership with teacher training colleges:

(a) that each university should establish a School of Education, it being understood that some universities may find it desirable to establish more than one such school;

(b) that each University School of Education should consist of an organic federation of approved training institutions working in co-operation with other approved educational institutions; and

(c) that University Schools of Education should be responsible for the training and the assessment of the work of all students who are seeking to be recognised by the Board of Education as qualified teachers.

(The McNair Report, 1944: Paragraph 182)

By 1951 these partnerships were in place and the number of trainee teachers stood at 25,000, double the number in training in 1939. Also in 1951 came the introduction of the minimum entry requirement to teaching training of five Ordinary level passes and the requirement that only those who held the status of Qualified Teacher could serve in schools (Keating, 2010).

By 1960 all two year course had been phased out in favour of the three year certificate course. Eighty-five percent of the students in training colleges were training to be primary school teachers, with the remaining fifteen percent allocated to the training of teachers for secondary schools in subjects where there was a shortage of teachers, although some colleges trained more than this by combining upper juniors with lower secondary. In what Dent (1977:137) referred to as ‘...the two crucial issues both of which have been battle grounds since training began’, colleges, universities, the government and teachers organisations debated whether the emphasis of training should be on personal or professional education and how to balance the theoretical and practical aspects of the professional training. Time during the three years training to be spent in schools on practice was agreed at

between sixty and ninety days. The final award of the certificate was deemed to be the equivalent of a pass degree. In 1963 the Robbins Report recommended that in addition to the three year certificate course, a four year degree course (Bachelor of Education, BEd) was offered to those students who met the a set of qualifying Standards at the end of their certificate course. The James Report in 1972 recommended that teaching should become an all graduate profession because teachers needed to be sufficiently prepared for the challenges of teaching in a changing society. This preparation required time and higher education to equip teachers to the standards of a profession:

‘The recommendations....we make for the pre-service training and induction of teachersare based upon three propositions. The first is that the needs of our society and the implicit standards of a key profession require that no young man or woman should be accepted for training as a teacher until a full course of higher education. The second is that, whatever methods of educating and training teachers may be developed in future, the time has come to abandon the formal distinctions between the two main existing types: that is, three years of concurrent training for non-graduates and one year of consecutive training for graduates. These present distinctions, although increasingly blurred during the last decade by the development of degree work within the colleges and of concurrent courses in some universities, run sharply through the whole profession (in its career and salary patterns, for example) and are obsolete. The third proposition is that no teacher can in a relatively short, or even in an unrealistically long, period at the beginning of his career, be equipped for all the responsibilities he is going to face. This familiar truth has been given a disturbingly sharper edge in a world of rapidly developing social and cultural change.’

(The James Report, 1972:3.1)

Dent’s concluding paragraph, written in 1977, reflected his concerns about the potential impact of the implementation of the James Report:

‘Thus has ended a system of teacher educating and training which had endured for nearly two centuries. Throughout that long period the training

college curriculum and the methods employed to apply it, though progressively altered and improved in detail, remained basically the same. The system had many defects, but it was not without its virtues. It has been deliberately destroyed. One can only hope that its successor, whatever form this may ultimately take, will be sufficiently better to justify its execution.'

(Dent, 1977:155-156)

Almost forty years on I do not feel able to answer Dent's concern about whether the succeeding years' reforms have justified the end of the training system which he felt had merit. It is likely, I believe, that some aspects of training may well have improved but the fact that the current government is involved in yet another major reform of the system suggests limited success. Dent's long involvement in education took place in the early and middle years of the twentieth century. The final two decades of this century saw a new approach to the work of public bodies, including those concerned with education, where they came under increased political control by the government of the day.

1980 to 2010

Reviewing the successive governmental approaches to education policy over the thirty years between 1980 and 2010 reveals a marked shift to increased centralisation of educational policy. This appears largely due to political concerns about the unaccountability of teachers and the relevance of the taught curriculum; and to the increase of a market-based approach to public services which required education bodies to implement sets of policies and to be held accountable for the expected outcomes. This time period saw the introduction, among other things, of: the National Curriculum as part of the Education Reform Act of 1988; the creation of the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted); the emergence of Standard

Assessment Tests in primary schools (SATs); the establishment of competences and Standards by which to judge teachers and trainee teachers; and the opening up of a wider variety of routes into teaching. Kydd (1997) summarised the reforms which took place during this period as the reorganisation of the education system in accordance with the principles of the market place.

In terms of teacher training this period centred on the political debate about the control of teacher education, summarised among others by Wilkin (1996), McBride (1996), Hoyle and John (1998) and Goodman (2002). The debate linked to the emergence of the centralised curriculum and testing regime which dictated what pupils needed to learn and how this was to be measured – and with this in place the debate was about the skills needed by the teacher to deliver effectively such a system. Much of this concerned what Booth, Furlong and Wilkin (1990) described as the debate about the movement away from the idea that theory of education determined practice. In 1983 a government report, *Teaching Quality* (DES, 1983) suggested trainee teachers required exposure to theory as the discipline of education and exposure to practice as a means of acquiring skills in schools. Hoyle and John (1998) believed this debate polarised teacher training into a basic dilemma of profession versus craft, in which they defined profession as education, which is the understanding of theory and university-based, whilst craft was defined as training, which was practical, skills based and practised in schools.

A key aspect of the debate was the consideration of what was it that schools and Higher Education Institutes (HEIs) did best for trainee teachers and at what they were less effective. Reviewing teacher training reforms Blake (1997) discussed a

range of critical views (O'Hear 1988; Cox, 1989; Lawlor, 1990) saying the reforms represented groups of right-wing thinkers who believed that university-based teacher training was insufficiently rigorous in taking account of classroom practice. The argument made was that expertise in teaching lay with those in schools and thus this was where teacher training should be located. Hargreaves (1994) largely supported this idea but suggested a partnership approach between schools and HEIs was needed, with experienced teachers in schools leading teacher training and HEIs providing training for mentors and teachers. He argued in favour of the notion of teaching schools as the most appropriate route for trainee teachers to take to qualification, and this has echoes of the argument which can be seen in *The Case for Change* (DfE 2010a).

Others however made the case for a more theoretical approach. Ruddock (1989) argued that the analytical and reflective tools that good teachers needed took time to develop and were better nurtured away from the classroom, with Elliott (1991) noting school teachers and higher education tutors were not the same people. The view that increased school-based training can lead to a narrowness of training experiences was shared by Ozanne (1997), and by McNamara (1994) who stated school-based training restricted reflections to limited circumstances. Linked to this, Alexander (1993) suggested training teachers was distinct from teaching pupils and assumptions that teachers and schools are readily equipped and resourced to become teacher trainers were simplistic.

Despite these concerns a review of developments in Initial Teacher Training during this period illustrated the move towards a widening role for school-based training,

supporting both the traditional three or four year primary school student teachers on the BEd route and the increasing number of primary student teachers who began to train by means of an initial subject degree followed by a one year Post Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE) course, a route initially designed for secondary school training. Booth, Furlong and Wilkin (1990) cited The Department for Education and Skills (DES) circulars 3/84 (DES 1984) and 24/89 (DES 1989) as bringing about a partnership element in teacher training whereby trainees spent a greater proportion of their training year in schools supervised by experienced and practising teachers. Circular 9/92 (Department for Education 1992), as discussed by Landman and Ozga (in Ginsberg and Lindsay, 1995) shifted the training balance from Higher Education Institutes (HEI) in favour of schools playing a lead role in training. Furlong *et al* (2008) noted Circular 14/93 (DfE 1993) as marking the formal end to university autonomy over initial teacher training and the opening of new routes into teaching through the establishment of a new body, the Teacher Training Agency (TTA) as an organisational, but not academic, agency to control the direction of teacher training. This loosening of academic control allowed the creation of a marketplace in which a wider range of routes into teaching could emerge. Aplin (2001) suggested that part of this remit was to promote schools being able, if they wished, to play the leading role in planning and providing initial teacher training courses. The impact of a market-based approach to teacher training resulted, noted Ball (2013:168), in Circular 4/98 (DfEE, 1998):

‘...finally eradicating the intellectual and disciplinary foundation of teacher training, which was replaced by a skills and classroom management curriculum.’

In September 1993 the TTA launched the School Centred Initial Teacher Training (SCITT) programme, building on earlier schemes such as the Licensed and the Articled Teacher Schemes. In 1997 the Employment Based Initial Teacher Training Scheme (EBITT) Graduate Teacher Programme (GTP) came into existence. Initially the GTP was described as a route into teaching for graduates who preferred a non-traditional route into teaching to the conventional PGCE. One of the key points for this non-traditional route was that the trainees would be employed at the school through their training year and have tailor made training courses based on individual pre-service needs analysis.

Foster (2000) noted that in the early days of the GTP many trainees were experienced educators: unqualified; peripatetic; Further Education (FE); or overseas teachers. Because educators such as these had a track record in education this made individual programmes viable. However, Foster's (2001) later research noted that revisions made by the TDA to the GTP opened up the route to recruits who did not have substantial previous experience in education but who trained as mature entrants. Mayotte (2003) defended this action by identifying some mature entrants as career switchers and noted that they thus brought to teaching skills gained in other work which offered a strong sense of purpose. Williams and Soares (2002) identified this as an ideological commitment to attract into teaching individuals who were unable or unwilling to undertake traditional routes into teaching and they acknowledged that this might have been viewed as a pragmatic decision to meet the need to recruit teachers. This was something Foster (2001) found aspects of in his research on a secondary SCITT offering the GTP and which was cited as a

concern by The National Association of Headteachers (NAHT 1997), Landman and Ozga (1995) and Furlong, Barton, Miles, Whiting and Whitty (2000).

Blake (1997) described the development of SCITTs as proof of increased marketisation of teacher education by means of creating a choice of routes to qualification. This was designed to create a new balance in the existing partnership arrangement for teacher training by putting the school in the lead, to include transferring resources traditionally held by universities to the schools and potentially reducing the perceived value of academic aspects of the more traditional teacher training routes. Prospective teachers now had a choice of training routes as HEIs and SCITTs competed for their consumers, reinforcing the market-place approach.

The GTP underwent significant reform in 2001 to create Designated Recommending Bodies (DRBs) to manage the provision. In addition the DRBs were to be held accountable for the quality of training offered through external scrutiny by the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted). In a review of its first year of inspections of DRBs, Ofsted (2005) concluded that although the trainees' main strength was their professionalism in terms of their relationships with pupils and colleagues, fewer trainees taught very good lessons and more taught unsatisfactory lessons than their counterparts on more traditional routes into teaching. Other concerns included the capacity of schools to meet training needs across the range of the required Standards and the use of trainees to fill teaching vacancies. In 2007 Ofsted issued an overview of three years of inspections of DRBs and noted substantial improvements in primary school trainees' teaching but suggested there was still

room for improvement for secondary trainees who remained less skilled than their PGCE counterparts.

2010 Onward

With the election of the Coalition Government in May 2010 came consolidation and expansion of the market-based approach to education to include the training of teachers and the continued use of comparisons to judge educational performance. This was especially in terms of international performance indicators such as the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) global school rankings where the United Kingdom was perceived to have performed less well than other countries. In November 2010 the Government published *The Importance of Teaching: The Schools White Paper* (DfE 2010b). In the introduction to this, signed jointly by Prime Minister David Cameron and Deputy Prime Minister Nick Clegg, came the acknowledgement that there had been much debate about education but ‘...what really matters now is how we’re doing compared with our international competitors’ and to overcome this the government planned to ‘...devolve as much power as possible to the front line, while retaining high levels of accountability’ (DfE 2010b: Introduction). Avis (2011:431) described this as ‘...devolving power and autonomy to the lowest level possible’ but noted that ‘...the state nevertheless sets the direction of travel against which performance is measured’.

The front line was identified predominantly as schools. Given the level of political control over education in the last forty years some might view this as a government abdicating responsibility by directing the role of improving international comparisons to schools and the accountability for its success or failure. In terms of

teaching training the front line meant schools rather than HEIs where trainees would go directly into schools, with this being named School Direct training. In his speech to the House of Commons to introduce the White Paper, the Secretary of State for Education, Michael Gove, in defining the importance of teaching, sought to justify this action by stating ‘...the best school systems recruit the best people to teach, and train them intensively in the craft of teaching’ (Gove 2010: Online).

There are echoes here of the approach to teacher training adopted by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge in 1707 – which might be considered as coming full circle. Mr Gove appeared to be promoting practice over theory in defining teaching as a craft best learned at the hands of masters and placing those masters as serving teachers in the classroom. Learning how to be a teacher, according to Mr Gove, does not require academic study. This perhaps explains his insistence that academies could employ unqualified teachers as they too would learn on the job without the need for any study of teaching and learning.

To offer support to these views an additional document was issued with the White Paper entitled *The Case for Change* (DfE, 2010a) and it cited Hobson *et al*’s (2009) research findings that trainees who took employment based route into teaching, such as the GTP, were significantly more positive about the way their training prepared them for the reality of life in the classroom than trainees from university based routes. The Schools White Paper (DfE, 2010b) proposed that one of the School Direct routes into teaching would be training provided by a national network of teaching schools, modelled on teaching hospitals, who would take the lead in providing and quality assuring teacher training in their area. The DfE (2015:Online)

defined teaching schools as ‘...outstanding schools that work with others to provide high-quality training and development to new and experienced school staff’.

Teaching schools, it suggested, were part of the government’s plan ‘...to give schools a central role in raising Standards by developing a self-improving and sustainable school-led system’ (DfE, 2015: Online). These schools were identified, or labelled, as outstanding through the grade given in their inspection by Ofsted.

In June 2012 the newly created Teaching Agency (TA) announced the end of the GTP and its replacement with an extension of the School Direct approach to include salaried places from September 2013 and this was named the School Direct Salaried route (SDS). In addition a School Direct Unsalaries Route (SDUS) was also established to allow schools their own PGCE training places where they took the lead on training and were able to decide on the HEI partner of their choice. The TA (2012: 3) described this move as intended to introduce ‘...market choice’ to the teacher training system. Indeed, in February 2014 Michael Gove, said School Direct was allowing ‘...schools to shop around between universities for the best support for trainee teachers’ (DfE, 2014: Online).

In June 2012 Gove (DfE, 2012: Online) spoke about teaching schools noting that there was a small but increasing number of these but by 2014 he was highlighting the fact that ‘...we have also set up almost three hundred and fifty teaching schools – schools which are outstanding in their quality of teaching and which support other schools to improve teacher training’ (DfE, 2014: Online). Others were less certain about the merits of teaching schools. Husbands (2015:32) suggested teaching schools had developed rapidly but that they lacked ‘...a clear articulation

of what they are for'. Murray and Passey (2014:503) expressed their concern that teaching schools may '...encourage students to replicate in uncritical ways the local practices they see'. Gilroy (2014:631) believed the emergence of teaching schools would herald the end of '...a stable system of teacher education based on genuine partnership, mutual respect and consensus'.

The government's policies to make schools the front line service in teacher training, as identified in the introduction to *The Importance of Teaching: The Schools White Paper* (DfE 2010b), were voiced most prominently by three people: Michael Gove, Secretary of State for Education; Michael Wilshaw, Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Schools; and Charlie Taylor, Head of National College for Leadership and Schools (NCLS). The NCLS went on to become the National College for Teaching and Learning (NCTL) after it was merged with the Teaching Agency to assume responsibility for teacher training alongside responsibilities for schools, and this continued to be led by Charlie Taylor until August 2015. A review of some of their major speeches reveals all three men used international comparisons to justify their policies, exemplified by Michael Gove who noted '...we have looked all over the world in developing our policies' (Gove, 2012: Online).

In terms of what government policy changes meant for schools all three men made frequent use of the words 'freedom' and 'autonomy' to describe what they believed their policies were offering schools (Gove, 2012: Online and 2014: Online; Wilshaw, 2014: Online; Taylor, 2014: Online). This freedom and autonomy appeared to be largely from the control of local authorities whose control and influence over schools successive governments since the 1980s have acted to reduce. Wilshaw

(2014: Online) suggested these greater freedoms for schools would allow them to be ‘...the masters of their own destiny’ but this may be disingenuous. This is because the idea of freedom and autonomy appears to be in contrast to other aspects of speeches from the three men. They have all spoken about accountability and challenging schools they perceived to not be good enough, exemplified by Gove who stated that ‘...the government has set tough minimum standards by which schools will be judged’ (Gove, 2014: Online) and Wilshaw who noted that ‘...no one from outside school – least of all Ofsted – is going to tell teachers how to teach as long as children are learning, progressing and achieving good outcomes’ (Wilshaw, 2014: Online). The use of the phrase *as long as* by Wilshaw is an interesting one and appears to limit the sense of schools being masters of their own destiny and especially as the speech then goes on to provide a list of things Ofsted expect to see when in schools in terms of testing, target setting, meeting curriculum requirements and setting standards. It appears schools can have freedom and autonomy as long as they do as they are told.

Teach First is a teacher training programme, with charity status, designed to attract graduates who might not be considering teaching as a career to train and teach, initially, for two years with a view to becoming leaders in schools. Teach First encourage these graduates to ‘...commit to teaching in a state school serving low-income communities for a minimum of two years’ (Teach First, 2015: Online). The Teach First programme has been hailed as a success within government with Gove (2014: Online) triumphing its ‘...elite badge’ and Wilshaw (2014: Online) noting that it ‘...attracts the best’. Although initially focussed on providing secondary school

teachers the government has now provided funding for Teach First to expand into primary and early years. In their research into Teach First, Allen and Allnott (2013:87) noted that the programme has had an impact in terms of making teaching a more attractive career to graduates but they cautioned that this was partly due to the elite brand it portrayed and they suggested that any expansion of the programme could be problematic as ‘...maintenance of its position as a premium brand is somewhat contingent on retaining exclusivity’. It seems unlikely then that a programme such as Teach First can supply a sufficient number of newly qualified teachers and indeed Teach First’s director of research Sam Freedman suggested that only fifty-four per-cent of its teachers remain in the classroom after three years (Freedman, 2014:Online).

This may be one reason why Gove, Wilshaw and Taylor also praised the School Direct training routes with Taylor (2014: Online) noting how ‘...School Direct presents a fantastic opportunity to attract the best graduates into teaching and groups of schools and academy chains are now offering real career developments to compete with the best graduate employers’. Teach First and Schools Direct thus present examples of the ideology of the market place where schools, rather than HEIs, are considered by the government to be the leaders of the training and employment of graduates seeking to become teachers.

It could be suggested this is a move to circumvent the involvement of HEIs because this will provide better training of teachers or perhaps because it will provide cheaper training. This approach reinforces the promise, or perhaps threat, made by Gove in 2012 when he said about teacher training providers such as HEIs that ‘...if

schools don't rate their provision then they will go out of business' (Gove, 2012: Online). As Ofsted will continue to 'rate' schools and teacher training by means of the inspection process this creates the question of what might happen if Teach First, the schools and the academy chains providing teacher training are found to be wanting. Or perhaps the market place approach will dominate and any such unsuccessful school or academy chain will simply be taken over by others and eventually there will four or five big chains controlling many of the schools and teacher training providers – something along the lines of the big supermarket chains with a few smaller, cheaper providers snapping at their heels. Rather than creating a competitive market place, which is what the government said it was in favour of, this appears to be narrowing the market in limiting the number of routes into teaching available to prospective teachers.

Summary

A review of the history of teacher training reveals a recurring debate about how teachers should be trained. Training began as school based training and appears to have gone full circle and returned to being school based, with practice and apprenticeship at its heart. In the intervening years the debate has been about the knowledge, skills and understanding that teachers may not gain through practice alone. From the 1980s onwards this debate has become an increasingly political one with the level of centralised control and the ideology discourses associated with the competitive market-place exerted over education as a whole to include the provision for teacher training. Teacher training provision has been subject to a number of reforms and is currently in the middle of major reform. If the debate

about the training of teachers was able to move beyond the prevailing ideology of the government of the day it might be possible to move beyond recurrent reforms. The debate about teacher training could benefit from greater consideration of what it is that good teachers do and how, or whether, this can be identified. If it is possible to identify this then it should, in theory, be possible to use this information to inform policy on how best to train people in order that they can become teachers fit to practise.

How best to train teachers

This section begins with consideration of literature on what it is a good teacher does and how this might be identified. This is followed by a discussion on the use by successive governments of competences in the form of Standards to provide a framework against which the attributes of teachers might be judged. Included here is a look at how Ofsted have established sets of criteria for measuring how well teachers do what it is they do and how these have been used in teacher training. This is followed by a consideration of the role of theory and practice in developing teacher knowledge for trainees. This section concludes with consideration of the relationship between schools and teacher training providers.

What makes a teacher fit to practise?

It is in headteachers' interest to have the highest quality of teachers available to teach in their schools and for teachers in training to be supported to become teachers fit to practise. In addition, as schools are increasingly being pushed to the frontline of teacher training, it is important to establish whether there is broad agreement about the identification of what it is that makes a good teacher. With

agreement would come a level of consistency which could support primary schools, especially small schools, where they might be involved in training small numbers of trainees in one academic year.

The question of what makes a good teacher appears, in a search of the literature, to be a difficult one to answer. Korthagen (2004) cautioned that putting into words the essential qualities of a good teacher was no easy task. This was a view echoed by The House of Commons Select Committee on Education (2012:16) which concluded that ‘...coming up with a decisive list of qualities [of great teachers] is a difficult and complex exercise’. An interesting assertion given the government’s set of Standards for teachers (DfE, 2011), which are discussed later in this section. The Committee’s conclusion was, however, shared by Cochran-Smith (2004:3) who stated ‘...there is no consensus about how to define teacher quality’. There is a sense that it is almost too difficult to put into words all the things that a good teacher is and does and that attempts to do this (such as Standards) cannot fully capture the essence of the good teacher.

There has been research aimed at identifying some of the more challenging aspects of defining teacher quality. Reichel and Arnon (2009) in their research cite earlier studies including that of Barr (1958) who identified personal qualities such as tolerance, open-mindedness and cooperativeness and Tuckman (1965) who believed good teacher were original, dynamic, organised and warm. Reichel and Arnon (2009:17) came to their own conclusion that a good teacher was an ‘...educator and a principled person’. There remains however the need to explore what being ‘an educator’ really means and to identify what might be the principles

by which the good teacher operates and how they apply these in their professional undertakings.

The ability and willingness of good teachers in supporting children is highlighted in some of the research and these could go some way to describe the term ‘educator’. Kyriakides, Campbell and Christofidou (2002:505), in their study on measuring teaching effectiveness, reported that the dominant value expressed by teachers was the enjoyment of working with children. Darling-Hammond and Brailsford (2005:6) discussed that a crucial element of being a teacher was a commitment to help all students succeed. Osguthorpe (2008:296) described this as the ability ‘...to teach fairly, respectfully, magnificently, honestly and compassionately’. In a somewhat wider consideration Beishuizen *et al* (2001) divided the elements of a good teacher into two overall perspectives: personality traits such as enthusiasm and kindness; and practice traits such as being able to explain well, know how to adapt teaching to suit different needs and applying skills consistently. These practice traits appear a little easier to quantify than the personality traits which suggest that some people may have personal qualities which predispose them to becoming good teachers. Indeed Kennedy (2006:14) noted that societies ‘...have been arguing about why some people are better teachers than others since the days of Socrates and we’re not much closer to finding an answer today’. Kennedy (2006) put forward what she believed were the three main prevailing views on teacher quality as shown in Table 2.1.

Table 2.1 Kennedy’s (2006) hypotheses on teacher quality

Teacher quality is dependent on:	This allows teachers to:	Traits to look for in teachers are:

Their personality	Use their charisma to connect with and engage students	Creativity Intuition Kindness
Their beliefs and values	Include all students and to treat all students fairly	Honesty Integrity
Their training	Apply the learning acquired in a carefully structured teacher education programme	Subject knowledge Pedagogical knowledge

It should be noted that Kennedy (2006) cautioned that it would be simplistic to consider that any one of these factors provided the answer to what makes a good teacher, as it was her belief that an understanding of what makes a good teacher was located in how these combine with the context in which the teacher was working. This concern was echoed by Sockett (2009) who identified personality traits alone did not describe the work of the teacher but that they contributed to three dispositions to teach. He defined these dispositions as ‘...dispositions to act with awareness and intention’ (Sockett, 2009:295). Sockett (2009:296) went on to suggest that the disposition to teach could be categorised as three virtues, or as he suggested ‘...dispositions-as-virtues’. The first of these was character, defined as ‘...the kind of person the teacher is’. The second was intellect, described as ‘...the teacher’s stock-in-trade’. The final disposition-as-virtue was care, defined as ‘...children placed in their care’. Table 2.2 illustrates some of the attributes Sockett (2009) applied to each virtue.

Table 2.2 Sockett's (2009) descriptions

Character	Intellect	Care
Self-knowledge	Truthfulness	Receptivity
Courage	Accuracy	Responsiveness
Sincerity	Consistency	Tolerance
Integrity	Fairness	Tact
Trustworthiness	Clarity	Discretion
Endeavour	Thoughtfulness	Civility
Persistence	Open-mindedness	
Perseverance		

There are similarities here to Kennedy's (2006) list suggesting a level of agreement. In addition, Sockett (2009:297), like Kennedy (2006), identified the complexity of a teacher's work in highlighting that the challenge for teachers who held these dispositions-as-virtues was that they would be required to make '...sophisticated judgement in application'. The complexity is that not only must the teacher possess a disposition to teach but they also need to ability to be able to apply appropriately the virtues gained from this disposition in a range of circumstances and contexts. This may go some way to offering an explanation as to why it is so difficult to define the undertakings of a good teacher.

Rodgers and Raider-Roth (2006:265) explored the theory of presence to describe the '...complex and nuanced notion of what it means to teach'. The authors defined presence in terms of four aspects: awareness; receptivity; contextual knowledge and understanding (subject and pedagogical); and the ability to respond appropriately in the context. A similar view was taken by Lunenburg and Korthagen

(2009:227) who defined presence as ‘...practical wisdom’ which allowed teachers to go beyond their knowledge to ‘...perceive the essence of the situation’. This, the authors contended, was what allowed teachers to make wise decisions, linking to similar points made by Kennedy (2006) and Sockett (2009).

Hattie’s (2009) meta-analysis of how good teaching maximised learning acknowledged the complexity of teaching and suggested it was student outcomes which identified the good teacher. Hattie (2012:15) described the good teacher as one who constantly evaluated the impact their teaching was having on learners whereby ‘...an appropriate mind frame combined with appropriate actions work together to achieve a positive learning effect’. Teachers who did this, argued Hattie (2012), were passionate about learning, cognitive about pedagogy and dedicated to their job. These attributes allowed the good teacher to be prepared and able to adapt their teaching in response to their evaluations of learning. In addition the good teacher was open and willingly shared their learning and teaching with others. In a link to the work of Hattie, Hanushek (2016) argued that good teachers promoted effective learning in the classroom in terms of outcomes for students and that they did this consistently over the years with different cohorts. Picking up on the issue of variance, Hanushek (2016:25) noted that ‘...variations in teacher effectiveness within schools appear to be much larger than variance between schools’. These findings concurred with those of Hattie (2012) and those of Slater, Davies and Burgess (2012:643) in their study of GCSE outcomes who noted ‘...having a good teacher as opposed to a mediocre or poor teacher makes a big difference’. Similar findings were evident in Nield and Farley-Ripple’s (2008:299)

within-school study where they concluded that outcomes for students depended on ‘...the quality of the teachers who staff those courses’. This is not just the case in one school year, with one poor teacher, the effect continues to impact, as McBeath and Mortimore (2001:10) noted ‘...teacher effects are powerful and they are not limited to the time period pupils spend with that particular teacher’. This impact was of concern to Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector of Schools Michael Wilshaw who noted ‘...the outcomes at the end of secondary school powerfully reveal the impact of what has gone before. They also account to a large extent for success in courses and qualifications thereafter’ (Wilshaw, 2013; Online). Wilshaw expressed his concern about what he termed ‘...unseen children [who] can be found in mediocre schools the length and breadth of our country’ (Wilshaw, 2013: Online). These unseen children were to be found ‘...labelled, buried in lower sets, consigned as often as not to indifferent teaching’ and he declared that it was a responsibility of Ofsted to specifically challenge schools to address the needs of such unseen children to include ‘...schools previously judged outstanding, which are not doing well by their poorest children’ Wilshaw (2013; Online).

The teachers who impact on outcomes for students are the teachers fit to practise – they are the ones who make learning visible (Hattie, 2009). A review of the literature shows how difficult it is to define what it is the teacher fit to practise does. This, in turn, creates the challenge of identifying potential in those seeking to enter teaching, planning a teacher education programme to train such teachers and ensuring they have access to the type of continued professional development which will further enhance their fitness to practise. Consideration of studies showing

variance in the quality of the teachers highlighted the issue of impact on outcomes for children (Hanushek, 2016; Slater, Davies and Burgess, 2012; Nield and Farley-Ripple, 2008).

Since the Education Act of 1944 successive governments have focussed on issues of reducing inequality in education provision for all pupils in support of a more equal society. Lawson, Heaton and Brown (2010:8) described this as striving for meritocracy where ‘...individuals are rewarded on the basis of merit or ability and effort, and not according to social background’. One way to support the development of meritocracy is by means of education equality which will then contribute to the creation of a skilled workforce contributing to society for the good of all (Lawson, Heaton and Brown, 2010). Addressing issues of educational inequality has frequently been seen in terms of providing additional support to children in education through initiatives such as Surestart, Every Child Matters and education action zones. One of the most recent such programmes is the Pupil Premium scheme which provides ‘...additional funding for publicly funded schools in England to raise the attainment of disadvantaged pupils and close the gap between them and their peers’ (DfE, 2014; Online). As with previous initiatives this scheme focuses on providing additional resources, identified as contributing to success in education, to those perceived to have limited or no access to such resources. Gamarnikow and Green (2003:210) described such initiatives as designed to provide ‘...more equal opportunities for the worst off, while allowing the hierarchical opportunity structure itself to remain fixed and unequal’. These initiatives assume that the structures in schools provide the opportunities all

children need but that some children, because of their social backgrounds, required additional support to fully access these structures.

This does not, however, represent the whole picture in terms of equality of opportunity in education because it assumes ‘...all teachers are equal, which is patently not true’ (Hattie, 2003:18). Variations in teacher quality impact on the outcomes for all children and thus a focus on the initial training and the continued professional development of teachers would be a key undertaking in terms of pursuing equality of opportunity for all pupils through developing and supporting teachers fit to practise. The New Labour (1997-2010) and Coalition (2010-2015) governments approached this need by focusing on the establishment of sets of standards they perceived would identify good teachers.

The influential Hay-McBer report entitled Research into Teacher Effectiveness, published in 2000, was commissioned by the DfEE in the early years of the first New Labour government when the focus was on ‘...standards not structures’ (DfES, 1997). The Hay-McBer (2000) report was the precursor for the development of national Standards for teachers as part of the government’s educational reforms. The challenge was whether the complexity of teaching could be reduced to a set of units which could be measured.

The Hay-McBer report was commissioned as part of a government policy to create a set of Standards for teachers which would run from qualifying teachers to headteachers and for these Standards to be used as measures of performance. Hence there was a focus on effectiveness. The report suggested that effective teachers had three main factors under their control: their teaching skills; their

professional characteristics; and their classroom climate. In links to the views of Kennedy (2006) and of Socket (2009) on not seeing factors in isolation, the Hay-McBer Report (2000:1.1.1) noted that the three factors they identified should not be relied on individually but that they should be viewed in ‘...distinct and complementary ways’. The Hay-McBer report identified five sets of characteristics which they believed defined effective teachers. An overview of these characteristics is presented in Tables 2.3 to 2.7.

Table 2.3 Characteristics of professionalism (Hay-McBer/DfEE, 2000)

Characteristic of Professionalism	
Identified by:	Actions taken by teacher
Challenge and support	Cares for pupils Expresses positive expectations Strives for best possible provision Challenges others to overcome barriers to learning for all pupils
Confidence	Shows confidence in own ability Contributes positively Is professional Rises to challenges
Creating trust	Act reliably Act fairly and with consistency Lives up to their beliefs
Respect for others	Listens Values others Respects

Table 2.4 Characteristics of thinking (Hay-McBer/DfEE, 2000)

Characteristic of Thinking

Identified by:	Actions taken by teacher
Analytical thinking	Breaks down problems Recognises cause and effect Analyses variables
Conceptual thinking	Uses common sense Sees patterns Uses concepts Makes the complex simple

Table 2.5 Characteristic of planning and setting expectations
(Hay-McBer/DfEE, 2000)

Characteristic of Planning and Setting Expectations	
Identified by:	Actions taken by teacher
Drive for improvement	Wants to do a good job Creates improvements Sets challenging targets
Information seeking	Finds out Digs deeper Uses own systems
Initiative	Sorts out problems Thinks and acts ahead Prepares

Table 2.6 Characteristic of leading (Hay-McBer/DfEE, 2000)

Characteristic of Leading	
Identified by:	Actions taken by teacher
Flexibility	Has an open mind Adapts procedures Changes tack
Holding people to account	Makes expectations clear

	Sets boundaries
Managing pupils	Gets pupils on task and informed Takes action on behalf of the class Leads the class
Passion for learning	Creates a learning environment Shows how Supports practice and understanding Motivates pupils Promotes independent learning

Table 2.7 Characteristic of relating to others (Hay-McBer/DfEE, 2000)

Characteristic of Relating to Others	
Identified by:	Actions taken by teacher
Impact and influence	Persuades Calculates
Team working	Helps and supports Shares Builds team spirit
Understanding others	Is sensitive to others Understands behaviour

The focus of the Hay-McBer (2000) report was on teacher effectiveness and how this could be measured through pupil progress. Nonetheless there are links in the descriptions of teacher characteristics given in the report and the findings of others who were looking at teacher quality (Kennedy 2006, Sockett 2009, Beishuizen *et al* 2001). I find myself in agreement with Kennedy (2006) and Sockett (2009) in terms of looking for a predisposition to teaching, for someone having a set of qualities which would support them to be a teacher. But this is not enough: the prospective

teacher needs to have, or to learn, judgment on how to apply these qualities appropriately in any context. This represents the complexity of teaching.

A recent research study on good teachers was carried out by The Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtues (JCCV, 2015). The findings of this study suggested teachers believed good teachers could be identified through six main characteristics: fairness; creativity; a love of learning; humour; perseverance; and leadership (JCCV 2015). In links to the findings of Kennedy (2006) and Sockett (2009) the report stressed the contextual nature of the decisions and actions teachers have to take in noting that it is ‘...precisely because teaching involves engaging with unique individuals in unique situations that formal rules cannot possibly provide answers on how to act in every particular situation’ (JCCV 2015:9). For this reason the report questioned any reliance on codes of conduct such as Standards in being able to instruct teachers to ‘...act on pre-determined, rationally grounded principles’ (JCCV 2015:9).

Standards and QTS

The drive to establish a list of competences, later Standards, to describe the work of teachers has been a focus of successive governments. The influence of the Hay-McBer (2000) report on teacher training was first seen in 2002 with the publication of the document *Qualifying to Teach* by the DfES and the Teacher Training Agency (TTA) (DfES/TTA 2002). *Qualifying to Teach* set out the Standards that trainee teachers had to meet in order to be awarded Qualified Teacher Status (QTS). The very use of the word *standard* implies the ability to describe in a set of statements what it is that a teacher does and that in order to become a teacher trainees have

to demonstrate that they can do what the Standards describe. Thus their training will need to be structured to ‘...meet these specifications’ (Ozga, 2000:23). By doing this they will be judged as having met the Standards and thus will assume they are fit to practise. The Qualifying to Teach Standards (DfES/TTA 2002) comprised three categories, which reflected some of the findings of the Hay-McBer report (2000): professional values and practice; knowledge and understanding; and teaching. In each category there was a list of ‘...outcome statements that set out what a trainee must know, understand and be able to do in order to be awarded QTS’ (DfES/TTA 2002:1).

In comparing these outcome statements there were matches to four of the five Hay-McBer (2000) characteristics, although these matches tended to be reduced somewhat. An example of this can be seen in the Hay-McBer (2000) characteristic of planning and setting expectations where the matches are seen in wanting to do a good job, in setting challenging targets, in finding out and in preparing. What is missing from the Standards are descriptors of the use of critical thought. This links to the missing Hay-McBer (2000) characteristic comprising thinking. The descriptors of analytical thinking listed the key attributes as: breaks down problems; recognises cause and effect; and analyses variables. Hattie (2012:4) identified that the ability to engage in ‘...critical evaluation’ was the hallmark of the expert teacher who was focused on outcomes for children and thus a crucial focus for teachers in training. In considering specifically how novice teachers could be prepared to be this kind of good teacher Hattie (2012:32) noted that they would be best served by teacher education which focused on training which allowed them ‘...to know about the

effect that they have'. This, argued Hattie (2012:32) would allow novice teachers to understand the need to '...react to the situation, the particular student, the moment' because '...teachers work in remarkably varied situations....and in schools with much variance in conditions'. Hanushek (2016:24) was less certain of the role of teacher training in identifying the potential in trainees to understand issues of their impact on outcomes, noting '...it's easier to pick out good teachers once they have begun to teach than it is to train them'.

The absence of critical thinking in the Standards highlights that a set of descriptors cannot measure how teachers apply their knowledge, skills and understanding in the variety of contexts that make up their work. This was one of the main concerns about the creation of Standards to represent the work of teachers as noted by Bottery and Wright (2002:192) who described them as being used to '...transform teachers into the most regulated set of public-service technicians'. Nonetheless the New Labour government expanded the use of Standards to cover the work of qualified teachers across their careers (TDA, 2007). Following a review of the 2007 Standards by the Coalition Government a new set of Standards was produced, the *Teachers' Standards* (DfE, 2011b) which comprised one set of Standards applied to both trainee and qualified teachers. The DfE (2011c) described the Standards as statements of a teacher's professional attributes, professional knowledge and understanding, and professional skills, and claimed that they were reliable and consistent measures for the award for QTS. This claim of reliability and consistency was not without its critics, however. As Furlong (2008:730) noted such Standards

were '...regularly updated to keep in line with changing government definitions of what good teaching involves'.

Other critiques of Standards include reference to the narrow technicist underpinning assumptions. Cochran-Smith (2006) warned of the dangers of a list of Standards used to measure output noting that this could lead to a narrowing of the view of education to only that which can be measured. This is what Ball (2003) described as reducing teaching to that of a technician and echoed by Beck (2009:8) who described the approach as '...a matter of acquiring a limited corpus of state-prescribed knowledge accompanied by a set of similarly prescribed skills and competencies'. Taubman (2009) described this as focusing attention on general, rather than specific, categories of behaviour and of grading by numbers. This concern also surfaced in The Cambridge Primary Review (Alexander 2010: 411) which suggested that the qualifying Standards demonstrated a significant shift from the content of teacher training to market outcomes and noted that these outcomes were framed by '...the national curriculum, assessment and pedagogically-orientated strategies'. In reviewing evidence gathered for the Cambridge Primary Review Alexander (2010) concluded that the Standards focus on classroom skills to the detriment of trainee teachers' subject knowledge, broader understanding of education and independence of mind. Stevens (2010:187) went further and suggested that the Standards '...at best represent a severely limited vision of teaching, and at worst actually contradict much of what is, potentially at least, valuable experience of teaching and learning'.

Furlong *et al* (2008) argued that due to the formal requirements for QTS being almost entirely practical, growing numbers of trainees, whatever their training route, now enter teaching with little engagement in the more complex and challenging forms of professional knowledge. Alexander (2010) argued along similar lines suggesting an age-related element where younger teachers, who only know the world of centralised curricula and strategies, are content to comply and implement. Reflecting on these views, the failure of successive sets of Standards to consider the analytical and conceptual thinking other authors (Hay-McBer 2000; Kennedy 2006; Sockett 2009; Hattie, 2009) identified as crucial to the work of good teachers may lead to the training of some teachers who perceive teaching to be about 'delivering' an centralised curriculum in an approved manner.

The issues under discussion here are perhaps best summed up by Trotter, Ellison and Davies' (1997) discussion of competence and competency. Trotter, Ellison and Davies (1997:40) defined competence as '...what you have to do to do the job', so the skills which could possibly be measured through the Standards, and competencies as '...the predisposition to behave in ways shown to associate with the achievement of successful outcomes', the wider personal qualities which represent findings such as those of Hay-McBer (2000), Kennedy (2006) and Sockett (2009). Trotter, Ellison and Davies (1997:40) asserted that '...competencies are those factors that distinguish the best from the rest in a given role. They are not the tasks of the job, they are what enable people to do the tasks'. These competencies are not possible to measure and this may be one of the reasons why they are largely omitted from any sets of Standards.

Interestingly, the Hay-McBer report (DfEE, 2000) recommended psychometric testing for prospective teachers. In September 2012 such tests, initially commissioned as a feasibility study by the TDA in 2009, were to be provided to teacher training providers to screen prospective teachers in an attempt to ascertain if they possessed ‘...a blend of empathy, communication and resilience that is suited for life as a teacher and to spot students who are not cut out for the chalk face’ (TES, 2011: Online). It is interesting to speculate exactly how these qualities would have been measured but this would be a fruitless task as any implementation of such tests did not survive the migration of the Teaching Agency to the National College for Teaching and Learning. A speculation, however, was that running such tests nationally would be expensive and with the government’s policy of moving teacher training increasingly to schools perhaps the view was that those in schools could use their experience to provide psychometric assessment of prospective candidates for teaching.

It is feasible to consider that having a system which assesses outcome by measuring classroom skills against a set of Standards favours a more practical training route such as the GTP or SDS but this gives rise to the concern that the Standards are setting the training and development agenda. Kydd (1997) put forward an argument for this suggesting that ‘on the job’ training encouraged compliance and preservation of the status quo. This could be one reason for those trained on the GTP suggesting their training prepared them more effectively for life in the classroom (DfE 2010a). On the other hand it may be argued that by gaining practical experience of dealing with the realities of classroom life under the watchful eyes of

experts, novices enter their first year of teaching with a wider range of practised strategies to apply and a more resilient understanding of the role of the class teacher. However, Harrison (2006:434) cautions that such a system meant there was too much emphasis on what a novice ‘...can do’ and too little on what they ‘...can become’.

The focus on what trainees could do was also an approach by Ofsted as, in addition to meeting the QTS Standards, the achievements of trainee teachers were judged against the Ofsted (2009) grading criteria for trainee teachers. These were similar to the existing Ofsted criteria for judging teaching but which were written in a manner to acknowledge that the criteria were being used by teachers in training who would be expected to make progress during their training year (Appendix A). This system meant each trainee teacher was awarded an overall grade against the existing Ofsted school-based one to four grading system: with one being ‘outstanding’; two ‘good’; three ‘satisfactory’ (this predated the change of terminology to that of requires improvement for this grade); and four ‘inadequate’. Trainees were judged in four aspects: teaching; evidence files; explanations; and noticeable characteristics. This sat alongside the award of QTS which was on a pass/fail basis. Ofsted’s (2009) premise for this was that meeting the Standards, and thus being awarded QTS, was deemed as receiving a satisfactory grade but that there were trainee teachers who were better than satisfactory and that they should have the opportunity to have this acknowledged. So, as with schools, this was a system to grade trainee teachers quantitatively and to thus be able to compare trainee with trainee.

This gives rise to the assumption that whilst all successful trainee teachers might be awarded QTS some of them were better than others as witnessed by their Ofsted grades. This also gave Ofsted the opportunity to use the grades achieved by groups of trainees as part of the evidence base in inspecting teacher training providers. So trainee teachers, as well as having to meet and evidence the Standards, were also expected to meet and progress through the Ofsted criteria. Following the introduction of common Standards for all teachers including those in training (Teachers' Standards, DfE 2011b) Ofsted recommended that ITT providers should use the same grading criteria for judging teaching as is used in school inspections (Ofsted, 2014).

The use of the Standards and the grading criteria exemplify a market place ideology at work through the establishment of a set of competences as a framework against which performance should be measured and these measures used to compare performance, what Ball (2003) referred to as the dominant discourse of performance and accountability. Taubman (2009: 117) believed this approach resulted in '...understanding, wisdom gained from experience, an appreciation of the complexity and contingency of the art of teaching being replaced by standardised practices and measurement.' Stevens (2010:195) on the other hand suggested it was possible for a trainee teacher to be a '...reflexive practitioner and meet the Standards' but only as long as their training was underpinned and supported through theory and practice'.

Theory and practice

The debate about the role of theory in preparing trainee teachers for practice is a long running one - Joseph Lancaster was talking about it at the start of the nineteenth century, commenting that beginning teachers needed to know about organisation, administration, curriculum, methodology, examination, discipline and welfare. In 2006 Hagger and McIntyre noted that beginning teachers needed to know about teaching, learning, classrooms and schools. The debate seems to be how much of the theory underpinning these aspects do beginning teachers need to have. A policy of moving teacher training primarily into schools would suggest the view that these aspects can be attained through watching others (the masters) and copying their practice. If it were that simple it seems unlikely that the debate would have raged so long. It is much more likely that the theory- practice debate is part of the challenge of '...unpicking the complexities of teaching' (Edwards 1997) where novices are supported to develop understanding of the things teachers do as well as having the opportunity to practise doing them. Thus at the heart of the debate on the roles of theory and practice are the following considerations: the identification of what it is that trainee teachers need to learn about the job of the teacher; what they need to know; what the links are between theory and practice; and how best, and where, trainees might learn.

Smith and Hodson (2010:260) offered a succinct overview of '...the growing movement in ITE...towards a greater emphasis on practical experience in schools' and cited Hobson's (2003) findings that this was partly fuelled by trainee teachers suggesting they found practice more valuable than theory. The authors concluded

that a range of studies (such as those by Furlong, 1990; Williams and Soares, 2000; Furlong *et al*, 2000; and Hobson, 2003) found that ‘...trainees do see a role for theory in general but the way in which they come to see its place may differ according to their individual learning dispositions’ (Smith and Hodson, 2010:262). The difference appeared to be in how the trainees were able to apply theory to their developing practice, what Hayes (1999) described as being classroom ready. This links to Beck and Kosnik’s (2002) view that ‘...primacy of practice’ should dominate teacher training. Hagger and McIntyre (2006:35) defined this practice as teachers’ professional craft knowledge but acknowledged the difficulties in coding this ‘...as a body of professional knowledge....it is...knowledge-in-use’. Malderez and Wedell (2007:10) suggested teaching was an open and complex skill requiring ‘...great personal creativity and flexibility and some would say it amounts to professional artistry’, making their case that teaching is an art, a craft and a science. This, the authors contended, meant trainees needed opportunities to experiment, to see teaching practised, to practise it themselves and to have access to the latest scholarly thinking and research. Shulman (2002:38) identified this as ‘...pedagogical content knowledge’ which encompassed: engagement and motivation; knowledge and understanding; performance and action; reflection and critique; judgement and design; and commitment and identity. Grossman and McDonald (2008) described learning to teach in terms of core practices where knowledge, skills and professional identity are developed through practice. Grossman, Hammerness and McDonald (2009:274) argued that teacher education would benefit from building on these core practices ‘...to attend to the

clinical aspects of practice and experiment with how best to help novices develop skilled practice'. In doing this the authors suggested the divide between school and university, between practice and theory, could be broken down because '...teacher educators must attend to both the conceptual and practical aspects associated with any given practice' in order to allow novices to develop skilled practice, describing this as '...pedagogies of enactment' (Grossman, Hammerness and McDonald, 2009:278). The authors' discussion of pedagogies of enactment identified how novices were developed through interaction with skilled practitioners by being given opportunities to rehearse and enact teaching.

In moving teacher training primarily to schools the question may arise as to whether those in school are fully able to step back from their day to day practice to offer a conceptual view of practice. Hiebert, Gallimore and Stigler (2002:7) cautioned that the knowledge of a group of teachers in a setting can be '...incomplete...and insular'. This could result in trainee teachers seeing practice as what works in a particular setting. In their research on the craft knowledge of teachers Black-Hawkins and Florian (2012: 581) came to the conclusion that '...because craft knowledge is concerned with the everyday professional practices of individual teachers, it is not always easy for the experiences of one practitioner, in one particular context, to be made useful to other practitioners in other contexts'. Feiman-Nemser (2001) suggested a reliance on craft knowledge meant novice teachers could be forced into adopting the practices they saw in order to survive in the environment. This has implications for increased placement of trainees in

schools during their training as it suggests that practice in one context alone will be insufficient for them to develop skills as teachers.

This was picked up by Russell and Loughran (2007) who argued that a pedagogy of enactment was more than just teaching: it promoted reflection and critique which went beyond the technical and required experienced practitioners to support novices to develop their ability to reflect on their practice. Grossman, Hammerness and McDonald (2009:285) supported this view, noting one of the challenges to teacher educators was to ‘...develop skilled coaches who are able to provide rich feedback on specific practices and routines for novice teachers’. Similar beliefs were expressed by Wang and Odell (2002) who highlighted the need for the guidance of experienced mentors, Olsen (1996) who saw a transmission of practical knowledge from those who know to those who do not know and both Hargreaves (1993) and Moore (1994) who believed the acquisition of professional, or tacit, knowledge was best undertaken in schools.

Lawn (1990), however, warned against over-zealous promotion of teachers’ everyday craft knowledge deflecting attention from intellectual inquiry, something Spendlove, Howes and Wake (2010:66) suggested can result in ‘...the marginalisation of theoretical concepts and knowledge due to the prioritisation of day-to-day practices as the basis of professional preparation’. Carlgren (1996) argued that what was important was teacher professionalism and she defined this as the quality of a teacher’s work. This quality was made up of their professional knowledge, formulated on experience and context, and their professional wisdom, how they organise and use this knowledge. Carlgren (1996) believed that trainee

teachers should be involved in what she termed real teaching which supported trainees in schools to develop by creating opportunities for them to: name; frame; reframe; discuss and reflect; and formulate practice. This suggests training which goes well beyond any concept of watching a master at work and attempting to copy their practice and extends into trainee teachers having opportunities to rehearse and refine their knowledge, understanding and skills in teaching order that they can become teachers.

The preparedness or otherwise of school staff to assimilate responsibility for teacher training appears assumed by recent government policy – an approach which suggests those who can teach pupils can train teachers. Eraut (2004:255) struck a note of caution in identifying that in workplace learning ‘...the problem for professionals is not to exclude such experiential learning – they would be lost without it – but to bring it under critical control’. This critical control may require what Browne and Reid (2012:507) identified as ‘...practice [viewed] through the eyes of critical, knowledge and reflective pedagogy’ and gained by the study of theory away from the study of practice in schools. Harris (2011:30) commented that in teacher training one of the key roles of HEIs was to ‘...act as an alternative voice, challenging trainee teachers to critique what they see, offering alternative ways of approaching things and drawing upon current best practice as gathered through research and educational networks’, what Hodson, Smith and Brown (2012:193) referred to as ‘...the challenge to think’.

Grossman, Hammerness and McDonald (2009:287) argued that the time has come in teacher education to ‘...move away from a curriculum that symbolises the

separation of theory and practice....toward a curriculum that puts practice at the centre of all our endeavours' and this can be achieved by teacher educators '...developing their roles as clinical educators, able not only to profess about teaching, in the abstract, but also to provide the kind of skilled feedback and coaching that enables novices to improve'. The challenge is to create a practice-based curriculum which reduces the complexity for teaching for trainee teachers (Grossman, Hammerness and McDonald, 2009). One way to look at this might be to consider reimagining the partnership between those teacher educators working outside of schools, such as in HEIs, and the teacher educators who are part of the school staff, such as school-based mentors. On the surface it would seem that these educators are likely to have much in common.

Boyd, Harris and Murray (2007: 1) noted that teacher educators in England are '...almost always appointed with prior experience of being qualified school teachers, with considerable experience of teaching and of middle or senior management in the school sector'. McNicholl and Blake (2013:284) suggested this gave them the '...experience that is necessary to carry out the job of teacher education'. Shagrir (2015:784), in her study of teacher educators, found that they '...placed emphasis on their teaching qualifications', something Boyd, Harris and Murray (2007) suggested gave them credibility in the eyes of trainee teachers and school-based staff. Murray and Male (2005:126) identified teacher educators' school experience as first-order practice, their '...experiential knowledge and understanding of school teaching'. The authors continued to suggest that as teacher educators they were required to '...induct their students into the practices and discourses of both school

teaching and teacher education’, identifying this as the second-order practice (Murray and Male, 2005:126). The move from first –order practitioner in school to second-order practitioner in teacher education is not without its challenges. It is a complex process, with Boyd, Harris and Murray (2011: 6) believing this process ‘...involves critical changes in professional practice and identity’. Murray and Males (2005: 137), in their study of teacher educators moving from schools to higher education, suggested that this was not just a case of practitioners transferring knowledge about teaching gained in practice but rather it was ‘...about shifting the lens of that teaching to re-analyse their pedagogy in the light of their second-order practice as teacher educators’.

Those teachers teaching in schools and selected to work with trainee teachers are first-order practitioners. Their focus is on the classroom and its practices and they are often selected to undertake work with novice teachers because they are perceived to be expert practitioners. A fuller discussion of what this entails follows later in this chapter. But this is likely to be where precise differences may be viewed between the work of first-order and second-order practitioners in relation to Grossman, Hammerness and McDonald’s (2009:285) vision of clinical teacher training educators who will be ‘...skilled coaches who are able to provide rich feedback on specific practices and routines’. Current reforms to teacher training, particularly in terms of the focus on teaching schools, imply that schools and teachers in these schools, that is first-order practitioners, are fully equipped to provide the skilled coaching novice teachers need develop their teaching. A study

by Boyd and Tibke (2013) identified a number of challenges around this assumption.

This small scale study looked at school-embedded teacher training led by a first-order practitioner. The study concluded that such training contributed to the '...professional development of the experienced school teachers involved' and that this had the potential to expand into school wide improvement (Boyd and Tibke, 2013:42). The strength of the contribution by the school-based educator in the study was seen in the insights the educator was able to offer the trainees in terms of developing their understanding of school practice and linking this to their study of teaching. This aligns with Lunenburg and Korthagen's (2009) premise of practical wisdom and Korthagen's (2010; 104) identification of a '...realistic approach to teacher education'. However in their study Boyd and Tibke (2013:42) identified the potential for there to be insufficient time, resources and scholarly support available to fully meet the needs of school-based trainee teachers and that this would lead '...a performativity culture'. This resulted in novice teachers not being prepared during their training '...for a career as a critical thinking professional and classroom enquirer' (Boyd and Tibke, 2013:55).

Grossman, Hammerness and McDonald's (2009) vision of clinical teacher education requires both practice and study of teaching in a set of core teacher practices. This would enable trainee teachers to take on the role of the teacher by providing them with opportunities to enact that role and to receive the feedback which would enable their development as teachers. A collaborative partnership between school-based teacher educators who bring a realistic approach to teacher education

(Korthagen, 2010) and teacher educators who bring a critical lens (Murray and Male, 2005) could be a way to move teacher education beyond the traditional practice-theory divide. This would require ‘...an emphasis on the co-creation of educational and pedagogical meanings within professional communities of teachers-as-learners’ (Korthagen, 2010:104). Boyd and Tibke (2013:55) believe this could be achieved by collaborative partnerships in teacher education but were concerned that the speed and scale of policy reform will ‘...jeopardise such a scenario’.

Summary

What makes a good teacher, that is, a teacher fit to teach children, is a difficult question to answer but it is clearly more than can be conveyed in a set of Standards. Yet it is the act of being seen to meet the Teachers’ Standards (DfE 2011b), which are primarily concerned with demonstrating practice, which awards Newly Qualified Teacher Status. This compels those participating in teacher training to focus on the Standards, particularly in the one year routes of the PGCE and the SDS. This can result in trainee teachers putting their efforts into the technical aspects of teaching – the ones which are reflected in the Standards and perhaps failing, or not being given sufficient opportunity, to develop their critical thinking skills. Yet it is these critical thinking skills which will allow them to analyse situations and to apply judgement. Teaching requires a complex set of personal qualities, attributes, skills, knowledge and understanding and teachers need to be able to apply these appropriately in a range of contexts and with a mind to the outcomes for their pupils. To do this trainee teachers need time to be in schools to practise

their teaching, to observe others teaching and to engage in discussions with practitioners. But in order that trainees can develop as teachers in their own right they also need time away from school to study teaching and learning, to step back and analyse things they have seen and to be able to reflect on their own learning. As they are in training they will need guidance and support to do these things. There is expertise in the schools to support them in practice and there is also expertise outside of schools in HEIs to support them in theoretical study. Rather than have to choose one of these over the other, as the government seeks to do, it may be advantageous for the training of teachers to explore ways of creating partnerships which work to support teachers in training. Whether the speed and scale of current reforms will allow such collaborative partnerships to establish and flourish is up for debate.

Teacher training in schools

As government policy moves the lead on teacher training to schools and puts them in the front line this suggests a number of assumptions have been made. First of all, the assumption that schools have everything they need to train teachers – that by being schools where pupils are taught this means they can automatically teach trainee teachers. There is also the assumption that many, or most, schools are prepared to assume responsibility for teacher training alongside their existing responsibilities. There appears to be little consideration of whether schools, particularly primary schools, have the capacity or resources to train teachers, or indeed the willingness to do this. If trainee teachers are to spend most, or all, of their training time in schools they will need to have access to an environment which

allows them to study, rehearse and enact teacher professional knowledge and they will need the support of experienced teachers who are able to articulate the complexities of teaching.

In considering teacher training the question arises as to what type of school community and school climate is required to create opportunities to succeed for a trainee teacher. Lieberman and Pointer Mace (2009) suggested that a professional learning community was needed in order to allow novice teachers to be exposed to an articulation of the complexities of teaching. Wellman and Berkowitz (1988) described this as a professional network, or partnership, where ties are asymmetrically reciprocal, being different in content and intensity and where people within the network belong to categories. Castells (2000) developed this by noting that the social structure of a community of practice was through the interplay between relationships and that these relationships were based on power and experience, creating shared meaning. Lave and Wenger (1991) defined a network as a group participating in situated learning – culturally authentic learning taking place among persons, over time and in relation to a community of practice. Wenger (1998) later developed these views to suggest that within a community a novice can acquire skills through membership of the community through processes of sharing knowledge, practice and boundaries. Wenger (1998) identified three key elements to a community of practice. The first was the domain which represents the shared interest: for school this was the education of pupils and in terms of teacher training it was the supply of good teachers. The second element was to be a community: there needed to be members who were able and willing to

participate. Finally the members of the community needed to be practitioners, working together to create shared practice. In this sense every school could be deemed to be a community of practice but it is likely that these communities will vary widely as studies by Maynard (2001) and Hodgkinson and Hodgkinson (2004) have demonstrated. Cuddapah and Clayton (2011:73) cautioned that such communities can result in ‘...Groupthink’ where practices in the community are ‘...protected and reinforced’ resulting in little critical reflection. Maynard (2001) highlighted the nature of the relationships and interactions between participants in such communities as being a crucial factor in successful outcomes. Hargreaves and Fullan (2012) warned of contrived collegiality, teams put together for a particular task. Rather, suggested Fullan, Rincoin-Gallardo and Hargreaves (2015:6), there needed to be ‘...a collective capacity of the profession’ concerned with ‘...human capital (the quality of the individual), social capital (the quality of the group) and decisional capital (the development of expertise and professional judgement of individuals and groups to make more and more effective decisions over time)’. To achieve this, suggested the authors, required vision, capacity and leadership. The challenge to schools and leaders of schools is how to create this ethos, this professional learning, in their schools and, if appropriate, with any training partners to enable successful teacher training. If schools are to be in the front line of teacher training then they, and their leaders, will be accountable for creating the climate in which trainee teachers can succeed. Crow (2007:53) noted that the development of such a climate needed to be led by leaders who have ‘...the dispositions to move the school forward and encourage the development of norms, for example,

contributing to a learning community'. Bitan, Haep and Steins (2014:5) suggested headteachers were '...particularly responsible for the school's climate'. Brinia, Ziamionit and Panagiolopoulos (2014:31) referred to the '...formation of a culture' and this culture according to Tomlinson (2015:89) '...evokes rich meaning and a sense of belonging to something important'. The headteacher has to take on the mantle of what Senge (1990:356) identified as a leader who can '...foster learning for everyone'.

This leads into question the capacity for all or most primary school headteachers to take on this type of role in addition to all their existing responsibilities. With a changing landscape of teacher training where more training is taking place in schools, it may be the case that headteachers might wish to look at delegating some of the responsibilities for teacher training as part of the professional development of middle leader teachers. Lock (1995:315) suggested that this type of approach would be taken by headteachers who understood that increased teacher training in schools had '...the potential for staff development' but he noted school leaders needed to see this '...as part of the school's development plan and not a bolt-on extra'. Bush (2013:456) noted the benefits to professional development of future leaders of '...school-specific learning' and Portner (2005) suggested that increased teacher training in schools would benefit from the appointment of a professional mentor in teacher training who supported both the trainee and the mentor and who maintained strategic responsibility for teacher training in the school. It may be that this would be an approach more feasible in a large secondary school than in a primary school where the headteacher might consider they had to

assume the strategic leadership for teacher training as part of their overall leadership of their school. Headteachers may need to consider the impact on their role of greater involvement in teacher training in the context of the other responsibilities they have as contemporary headteachers now have to '...manage major multiple initiatives while at the same time attempt to shape the culture of their school' (Earley and Weindling, 2007:76).

In schools where the climate supports teacher training, participation in training in primary schools can be beneficial to the whole school. Price and Willett (2006) outlined gains in opportunities for reflective practice, smaller adult to pupil ratios, rejuvenation in terms of fresh ideas, teachers developing mentoring skills and benefits to future recruitment. Childs and Merrill (2003) noted that working with trainee teachers supported teachers' reflections on their own practice, something Field and Philpott (2000) believed was a prerequisite to continued professional development and which McLaughlin and Talbert (2006:4) identified as '...a professional learning community where teachers work collaboratively to reflect on their practice and make changes that improve teaching'. Veeman et al (1998) noted that teachers who undertake mentoring of trainees can develop expertise in mentoring and evaluating and these skills can be utilised within the school to foster a climate of continued school improvement.

Partnership

From 1984 onwards the role of schools in training teachers has increased with a requirement that schools work in partnership with training providers to train teachers. The nature of this partnership can vary from provider to provider and

from school to school. Although the term partnership suggests groups working together much of the actual partnership has appeared to be one of parallel provision – working alongside rather than with each other. This is likely to result in trainee teachers viewing their time in school as something separate to the time they spend studying and then perhaps not making the links, or not being supported to make links, between their studies, the theory, and their practice, undertaken in schools. In order for trainee teachers to succeed, believed Allen and Wright (2013:149), they need to have a clear understanding of the roles of those in the training partnership and the partners need to develop ‘...the preparedness’ to meet their responsibilities to the trainees.

Much of the discussion on partnership between HEIs and schools focused on whether the relationship was categorised as one where the partners were seen to have distinct roles or one where the relationship was deemed as a complementary one. Wilkin (1990:13) identified the distinct role as being concerned with theory (HEI) and practice (school) and describes the relationship as a ‘...partnership of reciprocal interdependence’, whereby each partner played to its strength during the training year. She saw this as a continuum where trainee teachers were exposed to theory which they used to make sense of their practice – theory-as-product, achieving Sjolie’s (2014) mutual dependence of theory and practice. Lampert (2009:23) identified this as a theory-practice dichotomy seen as a linear process ‘...one learns or articulates a theory, then uses or applies it’ but noted that this does not reflect the relational aspect of theory and practice in learning teaching, making the case that theoretical understanding requires rehearsing or

enacting in order for novice teachers to develop their teaching. Allen and Wright (2013:137) noted trainee teachers require ‘...opportunities to integrate theory and practice in the workplace’ and suggested this was best achieved through ‘...strong involvement from school and university staff ...to make explicit links between theory and practice’. This links to Murray and Passy (2014:503) who made the case for a complementary relationship noting schools to be ‘...vital places of learning’ and HEIs to provide ‘...its culture of research and the intellectual space offered for critical enquiry and debate into current practice in schools’. Doing this, suggested the authors, would provide trainee teachers with ‘...the abilities to work in HE and in different types of schools, learning to teach in knowledgeable and skilful ways, adapted to the multiple needs of the pupils and the diverse communities in which the school is situated’ (Murray and Passey, 2014:503). Smith, Hodson and Brown (2013:250) offered a similar view noting complementary partnerships acknowledged the roles of partners in the shared task of theory generation with HEIs offering ‘...a critical platform for assessing school based practice’.

The tension between these approaches is located in the theory-practice discussion as summarised by Hobson (2003:246) who believed that ‘...the shift to competence-based and school-based training means that student teachers are now getting what they (or their predecessors) always wanted, notably less time in HEIs, and less theory’. Spendlove, Howes and Wake (2010:66) described this as ‘...marginalisation due to the prioritisation of day-to-day practices as the basis of professional preparation’. Other studies however have shown that trainee teachers valued the role HEIs play in their training (Furlong et al, 2000 and Williams and Soares, 2002,

Allen and Wright, 2013). In addition Wilkin's (1990) findings indicated that headteachers were keen to retain links with HEIs and they valued the role the HEIs played in teacher training. Hodson, Smith and Brown (2012:194) suggested that the changes to teacher training have created the opportunity to recast the work of HEIs in teacher training to a more collaborative approach with their partners whereby '...capability is centred on the conception of theory concerned with producing generic teacher knowledge that can be adapted to meet the challenges of the ever-changing professional landscape'. The challenge here is who will feel able to take, and lead on, these opportunities in the current climate.

Partnership noted Wilkin (1990:8) can be dependent on '...the relative status and power of the two types of institution, and their respective representatives, and the form of collaboration between them'. This nature of such partnerships are likely to be tested as schools assume the lead for teacher training, something Taylor (2014: Online) believes will occur by September 2016 with '...an irrevocable shift from the centre to schools'.

Mentoring of trainees

The current teacher training requirements (DfE, 2014) dictate that trainee teachers must spend the majority of their training year in schools and that they must be assigned a mentor in the school to support them. Whilst most external providers have professional tutors who visit trainees, it falls to the school to provide a day-to-day mentor, often known as the school-based mentor. With the increased time spent in school by trainees, the responsibilities of the school-based mentor have grown. A review of the literature suggests these responsibilities have not, in all

cases, been matched by the increased training or time allocation mentors require to carry out their responsibilities. In addition it is not just the mentor who the trainee needs to work with, trainees need to look to other staff who have expertise in particular aspects of primary practice. Placing the majority of teacher training in schools appears likely thus to increase the workload of staff in those schools and in primary schools in particular this could result in teachers coming out of their classrooms to work with trainees. There are implications here in terms of ensuring continuity in pupil learning and of the organisational and financial capacity to free teachers from their classrooms to support teacher training. Boyd's (2002) study suggested the work of a school-based teacher training mentor is often undertaken in isolation with little support from other school staff.

Lipton and Wellman (2005:149) noted '...the ultimate goal of learning-focussed mentoring is to create colleagues who can fully participate in the professional life of a school'. The authors outlined three stages to mentoring novices: consulting, whereby the mentor shares essential information about learning and practices; collaboration, where mentors scaffold novices' development of approaches and solutions; and coaching, where mentors support reflections and actions of the novices. Similarly Malderez and Wedell (2007) proposed five key roles for a mentor: an acculturator, introducing the trainee to the culture of the school; a model of how to be a teacher; a supporter, through developing a trusted relationship with their mentee; a sponsor, introducing the mentor to resources, including people, to support them; and an educator, through integrating and expanding the trainee's knowledge sets.

Smith and Lay (2007) highlighted the responsibility of those in overall charge of teacher training in the school to select the right mentor. Jones and Straker (2006:167) noted that in order to make professional knowledge accessible to others the mentor needed to be a reflective practitioner so ‘...they were able to make explicit the links between theoretical aspects and classroom practice’. It was a key role of the mentor to integrate theoretical training and practical application – they were the bridge between the training a student teacher undertakes outside the school and the realities of the classroom. Webb *et al*’s (2007:186) study of a mentor group suggested training is crucial in order that mentors can ‘...discharge their complex role adequately’.

The study by Webb *et al* (2007) recommended that school-based mentors required the opportunities to work with other school-based mentors in a community of practice where they could develop and refine their abilities to apply the different types of knowledge needed to successful mentor trainees. These were summarised as practical knowledge – ‘...of procedures, processes and frameworks’ – and propositional knowledge – ‘...of reflection, negotiation and contestation based on evidence’ (Webb *et al*, 2007:186). The authors concluded that school-based mentors were mostly offered training on familiarisation of processes and paperwork. The Carter Review of ITT (2015) recommended that national standards for mentors should be introduced and backed by rigorous training for mentors that would go well beyond familiarity with the processes of the training.

It is possible that this lack of training for school-based mentors contributed to findings in studies by Edwards and Protheroe (2004) and Maynard (2000) where

some trainee teachers expressed dissatisfaction with the abilities of their school-based mentors to provide them with feedback that the trainees felt they could use to strengthen their practice. The feedback was largely descriptive and did not develop the trainees' understanding of applying theory to practice in the classroom. Lieberman and Pointer Mace (2009:460) suggested mentors needed to be able to '...deconstruct their practice, explain it to others and in the process learn how to facilitate learning', what Malderez and Wedell (2007) suggested entailed the ability to talk in informed and structured ways. Similarly Jones and Straker (2006:167) discussed the role of the mentor in terms of being a professional who was able to provide constructive feedback and critical discussion in order to enable the '...deconstruction and reconstruction of professional knowledge for both the mentor and the mentee'. Inability to do this created what Valencia *et al* (2009:304) identified as '...lost opportunities for student teachers to learn to teach'.

There was a suggestion in the literature that specific skills in teaching adults are required of school-based mentors and that this varies from the pedagogical approach school teachers might use in their classroom role (Turner-Bisset, 2001, Knowles, 1980, Webb *et al*, 2007). Indeed in the study by Jones and Straker (2006) school-based mentors stated they wanted more training in adult learning and the application of counselling skills. However Holmes and Abington-Cooper (2000) disputed this, suggesting that in initial teacher training the focus should be on identifying the type of a learning a situation requires and matching the teaching to it. Sweeney (2001) identified that training is essential for mentors and believed their training needs were as important as the training needs of those they mentor.

This raises the questions about the provision to train school based mentors in terms of who will be responsible for this. One question might be whether it is a role for HEIs or whether schools could do this themselves. Government policy suggests putting schools in the frontline of teacher training because that is where trainees will learn best but there seems little about those in school learning about teacher training. Nonetheless, the Carter Review (2015) made clear that training was needed for those in schools who support trainee teachers.

A concern raised in the literature was whether school-based mentors were given sufficient time to carry out their mentoring role (Webb et al, 2007; Jones and Straker 2006; Brooks, 2000; Cross, 1999). Brooks' (2000:103) findings suggested that '...demands on time were the single most important cost of involvement in school-based training' and these included the time for formal mentoring requirements as well as all those which arose from trainees' participation in the everyday practice of the school. Although this study was of secondary schools the author suggested primary schools were likely to provide a similar picture. Jones and Straker's (2006) study of the role of mentors found mentors believed they lacked the time to deal with the demands of trainees being mostly in schools and the extra work this gave them as mentors. In addition the authors noted that mentors felt they had '...to balance the needs of their mentee with the demands made upon themselves as practising teachers' (Jones and Straker, 2006:166). Lieberman and Pointer Mace (2009:466) followed this point by suggesting '...accomplished teachers become accomplished by committing to the classroom' and suggested this could limit the time they have available to work with student teachers.

One of the ways school-based mentors dealt with their workload was to look to other staff for support, with Cross (1999) noting the importance to the mentor that they are able to call upon a support network, to include the headteacher and other staff, and Jones and Straker (2006) noting that mentors valued a supportive school culture. As well as supporting the mentor other staff were required to share their expertise with trainee teachers to be able to allow trainees to do what Davies (2006:65) described as ‘...draw on a wider group of individuals with their knowledge and expertise in order to increase the pool of ideas and insights’. Brooks (2000:107) described the need for trainees to work with experts such as Special Needs Coordinators in her study where ‘...the range of staff who were drawn into the training process extended far beyond those with a designated role’. McNally *et al* (1997) stated that the quality of professional relationships impacted on trainees’ development as teachers. Indeed, Rots and Aelterman (2009:465) noted in their study of teacher training that this was one of the types of wider support which contributed to trainees’ ‘...sense of teacher efficacy and extended professional orientation’.

Brooks (2000:108) considered the need to involve the whole school community in teacher training because she perceived that ‘...the success of school –based training rests with the willingness and the ability of individuals to give well beyond the official minima of mentoring to which students were entitled’. This may prove a challenge for some primary schools and it may be that this is one consequence of more training time on school that has not been fully considered in terms of the demands on the resources available in primary schools for teacher training,

especially as viewed by Hobson's (2003:5) who believed '...all teachers in schools which participate in ITT should be aware of the importance of mentoring and should have some ideas about how to perform such a role effectively'.

Pressures on schools

The external pressures placed on schools may, however, impact on teachers' willingness to take on responsibilities beyond their classrooms. Furlong *et al* (2000) questioned whether the system of external monitoring of schools and teachers has created a climate where teachers lacked the opportunity to reflect critically on their own practice as they felt compelled to try to meet the external standards imposed on them, what Edwards and Protheroe (2004:194) described as '...urgent goals in a national system of public accountability'. Carney (2003) suggested that this public scrutiny, and the need to be seen to be meeting it, has significantly contributed to teachers being too concerned with their own needs and thus limited their involvement in ITT in their schools unless they were the mentor. Brooks (2000:111) concluded that '...the picture which emerges is one of complex, shifting, idiosyncratic, context-dependent, and, sometimes unexpected time requirements which are unlikely to be capable of an easy resolution'. The capacity of primary schools to accommodate the range of responsibilities for teacher training was questioned by Murray and Passy (2014:302) who believed this may be '...a tall order for any workplace, but may be particularly daunting for schools where the primary imperative is the education of pupils, not student teachers'. The authors continued to highlight small primary schools in particular as having more limited capacity to participate in teacher training.

At the present time primary schools and their headteachers can decide year on year whether or not to participate in teacher training. This means leaders have a level of control over their involvement in teacher training and can take into consideration circumstances in their school when taking decisions on participation. This may include consideration of how external pressures are impacting on the school, to include things such as impending Ofsted inspections. Hodgson and Spours (2011:146) described such pressures as comprising central policy levers of ‘...funding, inspection, targets and performance tables’. The main mechanism for holding schools to public account is through school inspections by The Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted). Ofsted is a statutory body and school inspections are mandatory. The premise of Ofsted is to regulate schools to ensure they are held accountable for their performance against national standards. Ranson (2003: 460) described such inspections as events at a specific time designed to ensure ‘...public trust is secured by specifying performance and regulating compliance’.

A study by Case, Case and Catling (2000:618) uncovered in that, even if successful in Ofsted terms, school staff believed there was no positive impact on effectiveness or achievement but rather ‘...negative influences of what they perceived to be heavy handed and excessive accountability’. Perryman (2007:188) found a similar picture in her study where ‘...the emotional impact of inspection, with its fear and loss of control and a sense of self, in the worse cases lead to teachers being unable to continue their work’. Jeffrey and Woods’ (1998) study of teachers’ perceptions of the impact of inspections noted senior leaders as describing inspections as a game they had to play but did not want to play. If this is considered alongside Muijs and

Chapman's (2009) view that headteachers were at the centre of any school inspection then it could be the case that taking on additional responsibility for teacher training, which itself is subject to Ofsted inspection, might not appeal to all headteachers. Or that there may be times in the life of a school when headteachers chose to withdraw participation in teacher training, to focus on aspects of development within their school. This has considerable implications for increased teacher training in schools because as schools take on increased responsibilities so others will lose these responsibilities, with the logical premise that these will be HEIs. Thus HEIs may have to withdraw from the teacher training arena which will necessitate schools taking on even more responsibility. So training places will need to be found in schools and schools will need to find trainee teachers to fill these places to ensure the sufficient supply of new teachers. But if schools retain the right to make their own decisions on participation, or the level to which they chose to participate, in teacher training then the system may be subject to short-term involvement and inconsistency, and a potential to be unsustainable. One scenario might be that schools will lose the right to make their own decision on participation or perhaps, more likely, participation in teacher training will become a criterion of Ofsted inspections of schools. Something perhaps along the lines of you cannot be an outstanding school because you do not train teachers.

Summary

The premise that because schools are already engaged in the teaching of pupils it automatically follows that they can take on the training of teachers appears to be a rather naïve assumption. Training teachers in schools takes involvement from

headteachers, designated teachers who take the role of mentors and from the wider school staff. It also has financial and resource implications, to include the cost of training staff to be involved in training teachers. Increased training in schools will magnify these but little government attention appears to have been paid to this aspect of their policy reforms.

Chapter Summary

Teacher training is in a changing landscape as government policy promotes the role of schools in leading the training. This is driven by the belief that teaching is a craft best learned in the place it is practised and from working with the practitioners of the craft. Yet this appears to be an over simplification of what it is to be a teacher, it seems to place doing above understanding. The on-going debate on the role of theory and the role of practice in teacher training, and who is best placed to lead on this, would not still be taking place if learning to be a teacher was so straightforward and success was easily measured by ticking a set of competences.

Placing schools in the frontline of teacher training makes assumptions about the willingness and the capacity of schools to undertake this role. Literature suggests teachers require training, time and resources, beyond those already found in the school as part of the provision for the education of pupils, to mentor trainee teachers. What appears to be missing from this discussion is the voice from primary schools, and particularly from those leading the schools who the government expects to take on increased responsibility for teacher training.

This study seeks the opinions of leaders of primary schools of how best to train the teachers they will employ in their schools and what they believe the role of their school, and other schools, is in successful teacher training and the factors that govern such success.

Chapter Three: Methodology

Introduction

This chapter discusses the methodology used for the pilot study and for the main research project. Both studies adopted an interpretivist approach to research and used grounded theory as the methodology.

The first section of this chapter presents the methodology for the pilot study which took a case study approach in one school to investigate retrospectively the perceptions of key participants of the factors which contributed to a trainee teacher on the Graduate Teacher Programme (GTP) attaining an outstanding grade at the conclusion of the training year. A purposive sample of three key participants was selected, ethical considerations considered and a total of nine semi-structured interviews were conducted. Data were analysed through use of a grounded theory framework. The research approach and findings were evaluated to inform the research approach for the main study.

The focus for the main study moved away from that of the pilot study as changes were made, and further changes proposed, at a national level to teacher training as discussed in the previous chapter. These changes, the findings from the pilot study which highlighted the role of the headteacher in teacher training in a school and conversations I was having with headteachers on the changing landscape of teacher training prompted me to move the focus of my research to one of exploring headteachers' perceptions of how best to train teachers fit to practise in schools. The second section of this chapter considers the nature of the research needed to explore the voices of twelve primary school headteachers in the research sample

and the method chosen to achieve this. The role of the researcher is considered.

The rationale for the selection of the research sample is discussed and ethical issues are considered. The theoretical framework of data collection and analysis is discussed, as is the trustworthiness of the methods used.

The pilot study

The pilot study aimed to investigate the perceptions of key participants in a school on the factors which contributed to the awarding of an outstanding grade to a trainee teacher on the Graduate Teacher Programme (GTP). A constructionist epistemological enquiry was adopted to access ‘...knowledge made real by human mean-making’ (Potter 2006:81). The purpose of the pilot study was to gather, record and analyse data findings which could then be probed in a main study. To achieve this, an interpretative approach using grounded theory was selected. An interpretivist approach allows researchers to use their social skills to understand how others understand their world and knowledge is constructed specifically to the situation being investigated (O’Donoghue 2007). Grounded theory is, according to Robson (2002), concerned with generating a theory relating to the particular situation of the research focus, with Berg (1998) noting theory seeks to explain events. Sikes (2006) developed this to suggest theories may provide plausible explanations for what is happening.

The pilot study sought to adopt Glaser and Strauss’s (1967) grounded theory approach which built on an assumption that theory is emergent and will arise from particularly situations. Adopting this view Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000:23) state this can lead to a theory which ‘...becomes a set of meanings which yield insight and understanding’ and which will ‘make sense to those to whom it applies’. This relates to the overall purpose of the research which, as Hammersley (2001) suggested, is to seek to advance knowledge relevant to educational policymaking and practice.

Case study

A case study approach took place in a training school where the novice completed his training year with the award of Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) and an Ofsted grade of 'outstanding'. Adelman et al (1980) and Yin (1994) defined a case study as the study of an event in action, although in this particular case participants were reflecting post-action, which involves empirical investigation of perceptions of a particular phenomenon in a real life context. Robson (2002:177) noted that in a case study '...the case is the situation, individual, group, organisation or whatever it is that we are interested in'. Hitchcock and Hughes (1995) considered many aspects of case studies and in particular that they can yield a rich and vivid description of events, roles, characteristics and organisations. Here the case was the successful outcome of a teacher training year as perceived by its key participants. The advantages of a case study design for the pilot stage of the research was in its flexibility and the richness of data yielded.

In conformity with a constructivist interpretative approach the research did not begin with a hypothesis which may or may not be confirmed through data collected. Rather it was narrative and exploratory – it sought to explore perceptions of what may have been going on and to provide what Geertz (1973) described as thick description of participants' experiences and thoughts. Bell (2002) noted that case studies allowed the researcher to concentrate on a specific situation in an attempt to identify '...the various interactive processes at work'. Bell (2002) went on to suggest that this approach may be useful in a pilot study, as a means of

identifying key issues which could then be investigated in a main study as was the purpose of the pilot study in the current research.

Nisbet and Watts (1984) acknowledged limitations to a case study approach and advised researchers to avoid selective reporting, blandness and an anecdotal style which may occur because of the potential difficulties in cross checking data gathered. Interviews were recorded and transcribed with the actual transcripts used as the first layer of themed analysis as a means towards addressing such limitations. As this was a case study where the participants were asked retrospectively about events it allowed them to reflect on their experiences and to provide a narrative account. This allowed the pilot study to be defined in a set context in a point in time and thus aided trustworthiness by delineating the content domain (Hartas 2010). In summary the pilot study sought to meet Stake's (1995) definition as an exploratory case study which examined a particular case in order to gain insight into an issue.

Sampling

Potential participants for case studies are identified to serve a particular need. In this study the need was to explore the perceptions of key participants of the factors which contributed to a novice teacher's outstandingly successful outcome in a GTP training year. To achieve this, a school where the trainee attained an outstanding Ofsted grade at the end of the training year was identified. For the study the purposive or theoretical sample was key participants in the training year: the trainee as the novice; the headteacher as the lead expert; and the school based

tutor as the practitioner expert as identified in Wenger's (1998) model of a community of practice.

Data collection

Data were collected by means of a series of nine interviews in three separate sets of interviews with the lead expert, the practitioner expert and the novice. The purpose of having a set of three interview stages was to enable recursive data collection which, after the initial interviews, would allow the data from the previous interviews to be analysed to inform the next set of interview questions to ensure sufficient information is gathered (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). As schools, and those who work in them, are busy places and committing to a set of interviews required the willingness of the participants I took a pragmatic decision to identify exactly how many interviews I was requesting so that the participants had a full set of information before being asked to give their informed consent. I considered having two sets of interviews but felt this might constrain the research as this would allow only one opportunity to analyse data in between interviews. Three sets of interviews allowed two opportunities for data analysis to inform further questions and this seemed to be a reasonable and considered request to make of the participants in the hope that they would feel able to commit to these.

The interviews explored participants' perceptions of good teaching, teacher training in school and the roles and responsibilities of those participating in the training. As Robson (2002) noted, grounded theory research involves going out into the field and thus interviews are the most common means of data collection in a qualitative approach. Interviews, according to Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000), allow

participants to discuss interpretations and express views and it was essential to this research that participants felt able to do this. Tuckman (1972) noted interviews can let the researcher inside the head of the participant, to attempt to elicit the stories they were willing to share. For the pilot study it was crucial to explore what it was that participants experienced in order to begin to identify relationships. Kitwood (1977) suggested interviews are transactions with inevitable bias and that this must be overcome by control measures but in a constructivist approach subjectivity is a given and in the pilot study this was addressed by triangulating data from the sets of interviews.

A semi-structured interview process was selected in order that participants could speak in their own words about what was significant to them and the interviewer could, if required, seek clarification or probe responses further. Charmaz (1991) advises the researcher to create a set of questions which fit the interviewer's topic and are sufficiently narrow to explore and elaborate the participants' specific experiences. Questions were kept to a minimum to allow room for participants to reflect and respond, with the opportunity for prompts to be given to probe further meaning (Appendix B).

Data Analysis

Miles and Huberman (1994) noted that qualitative responses, such as those from interviews, can result in an overload of data and advised that coding was a method for managing the quantity of data. Kerlinger (1970) defined coding as the translation of responses into categories to produce analysis. The pilot study adopted the Miles and Huberman's (1994) approach of analysing data for grounded

theory by means of three concurrent activities: data reduction; data display; and conclusion drawing and verification. Data were reduced by means of taking transcribed interviews and highlighting frequencies of occurrences to note themes and patterns. Themes were categorised to make good sense of the data and to provide the opportunity to explore any differences to establish variables. Emerging themes from initial analysis of the first set of interviews informed the second set, which similarly informed the third set of interviews. Miles and Huberman (1994) noted that themes established from the early interviews may be refined as subsequent interviews take place. Adopting a structured approach to the data gathered allowed the data to emerge – or to speak for itself.

Ethics

Before approaching a school to ask if they would consider participating in the research it was essential to ensure that the research process was capable of being viewed as ethically sound. Consulting the BERA (2011) guidelines I ensured that the research proposal for the school outlined the purpose and methods for the study so that participants would have sufficient comprehension of the research to give, if they chose, their informed consent to participate (Appendix C). I was known professionally to the participants, although not through working in the school, and I believe this supported participants in considering I had the competence to carry out the research. I guaranteed participants confidentiality in terms of not identifying the school, directly by name or indirectly by location or Ofsted report descriptions, or the individual participants by name. Data gathered would not be disclosed beyond the academic audience for the research without their permission.

Participants were given a copy of the final report when completed in order to demonstrate the ethical nature of the research and to allow a check on the validity of the analysis.

I first approached the headteacher who occupied what Denscombe (2002) described as the gatekeeper role. The headteacher controlled the access to the school and without her permission no research could take place. The headteacher was asked to allow the research to take place and to do this on school premises during the school day on three separate occasions, to allow access to two members of staff and to participate in the research in her role as headteacher. A request that all interviews were recorded on a voice recorder was made. On gaining permission from the headteacher I approached the other participants in a similar manner as it was essential that all consented to participate as together they formed the purposive sample for the case study. All agreed to participate in the research, suggesting openness to reflecting on their own professional practice. Participants were offered the opportunity to withdraw from the research at any point but none chose to do so. The pilot study took place following the receipt of approval from the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Education and Sport at the University of Bedfordshire.

Evaluation of pilot study methodology

The case study approach was a successful one for this type of research as it permitted an in-depth retrospective consideration of an event by participants who made up what might be seen as a community of practice whose enterprise was the development of 'outstanding trainee teachers'. The selection of three sets of

interviews with the participants, so nine interviews in total, allowed sufficient data to be collected without being unmanageable for either the participants or the researcher. The constraints of the research were largely about the lack of contextual data collected in terms of data such as the school's Ofsted grading, how many graduate trainee teachers the school supported, how long they had been doing this and the length of experience of teacher training of the mentor and the headteacher. Not having this context limited any drawing of conclusions about this community of practice from the data gathered.

The role of the pilot study

The pilot study for this research explored the topic of how best a school community could support a trainee teacher to achieve an outstanding grade at the completion of a teacher training year, via a case study approach, using the Professional Standards for Teachers (TDA, 2007) and the Ofsted Grading Criteria for Trainee Teachers (2009). These were the current systems at the time of the study.

Subsequently the Professional Standards were replaced by the Teachers' Standards (DfE 2011b) and the Ofsted grading criteria for trainee teachers abandoned in favour of use of the one set of Ofsted criteria for all teachers. Government policy on teacher training had changed to promote a greater role for schools in teacher training as articulated in Training the Next Generation of Outstanding Teachers (DfE 2011a). A focus on exploring what senior leaders in primary schools, particularly headteachers, perceived were the responsibilities of schools in a teacher training year seemed to be more appropriate than my original focus, given the changes in the natural context. I decided my study should move away from a case study

approach to take an interpretative approach, using grounded theory, of the perceptions of primary school headteachers of how best schools could support trainee teachers in order that they could develop to be the best teacher they could become. The purpose was to capture the voice of these headteachers as they reflected the experiences and views of teacher training against changing national policy.

The main study

The nature of the research

The aim of the main research study was to investigate the perceptions of headteachers of how best to train teachers fit to teach primary age children, framed within a changing landscape of teacher training. The research did not begin with a hypothesis so there was nothing to be tested but rather it sought to explore the attitudes and beliefs of a specific group on a specific subject. To achieve this an interpretive paradigm was adopted. Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000:22) defined this approach as one which seeks to ‘...understand the subjective world of human experience’. Scott and Usher (1999) described interpretivism as taking everyday experience and asking how meaning was constructed and saw the task of the researcher as providing interpretation of actions and practices within a meaningful and specific context.

Schwandt (2000), Burton (2000) and Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000) are among authors who have detailed the emergence of interpretivism in contrast to the positivist approach in the social sciences. Schwandt (2000) noted the on-going debate of whether a critical distinction exists between these two but suggested

that it may occur where natural science seeks an explanation and interpretivism seeks understanding> An example of what Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000:27) suggested were paradigms which are ‘...essentially concerned with understanding phenomena through two different lenses’.

Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000) and Trowler (1995) noted that criticisms of the positivist approach were focused on its limitations in terms of acknowledging attempts to reduce data to that which can be quantified or made mathematical. Critics of constructivist approaches (such as Bernstein 1974, Giddens 1976 and Layder 1994) highlighted that the situations, or social realities, that it explores are subjective. Central to this debate is the question of whether knowledge, or theory, is objective, measurable and predictable (positivism) or gained through interpretation of meaning and experience (interpretivism). This calls into question how theory is defined, or perhaps more importantly how it is defined in this research study.

Abend’s (2008) noted that there were a range of views about what theory was and this had led to disagreement and ambiguity. Abend (2008:195) presented seven formulations which he believed represented the variety of forms that could be defined as theory and he argued for a principle of ‘...ontological and epistemological pluralism’. This research study linked most closely to Abend’s (2008:178) third theory formulation which was concerned with ‘...a main goal to say something about empirical phenomena in the social world’. To achieve this the definition of theory that this current study adopted was that of Thornberg and Charmaz (2011:41):

‘A theory states relationships between abstract concepts and may aim for either explanation or understanding’.

In this research study the interpretivist lens was chosen to explore how a group of experienced practitioners viewed the phenomenon of training teachers fit to practise. The decision to identify headteachers as the experienced practitioners for this research was taken for a number of reasons. The first was having reflected on the pilot study, which was undertaken as a case study in one school, I wanted to explore headteachers’ perceptions of the roles schools could and could not undertake in training teachers fit to practise and to do this in more than one school to gain a wider understanding of viewpoints. My initial discussions on the role of schools in the changing practice of teacher training had been with headteachers and I was interested to find out the views of other headteachers. I was keen to pursue the type of initial discussion I had had in much more depth and felt interviewing participants, rather than sending out a questionnaire to a wider group, would allow me access to participants within their own frames of reference where they could draw on ideas with which they are familiar and comfortable. May (2011:136) suggested this action supported the researcher ‘...to gain a wider understanding of the subject’s viewpoint’.

As one aspect of the research was to explore perceptions of teacher training provision in light of recent and forthcoming national changes I was keen to capture what May (2011) identified as reflections on on-going processes and he advised interviews to be the most appropriate way to do this. The selection of headteachers seemed sensible in terms of this being a group who were most likely in schools to take the lead in making strategic decisions about teacher training in their own

school. As this study was primarily concerned with hearing the voices of headteachers interviews were considered the main source of data.

To access social reality a qualitative research approach is required. Denzin and Lincoln (2003: 5) defined qualitative research as ‘...involving an interpretative, naturalistic approach to the world [where] researchers study things in their natural setting, attempting to make sense of, or to interpret, phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them.’ The research began with an issue which needed to be investigated – in a changing landscape of the provision of teacher training, how did a group of headteachers view the training of teachers fit to practise? Creswell (2007) suggested an issue such as this should be explored through a qualitative study of participants so that their voices can be heard. This was a key aim of the study meeting what Creswell defined as:

‘...conduct[ing] qualitative research because we need a *complex*, detailed understanding of the issue. This detail can only be established by talking directly with people, going to their homes or places of work, and allowing them to tell their stories unencumbered by what we expect to find or what we have read in literature.’

(Creswell, 2007:40)

Creswell (2007) summarised recent literature on qualitative design (LeCompte and Schensul 1999, Hatch 2002 and Marshall and Rossman 2006) to create a set of characteristics of qualitative research which were supportive of the researcher and which were applied in the study. An overview of how this was accomplished is presented in Table 3.1 with some areas discussed in further detail later in the chapter.

Table 3.1 The qualitative characteristics of the main research study

Characteristic	Description	Applied to this study
Natural setting	Collection of data in the field	Researcher went to schools to interview headteachers
Researcher as a key instrument	Researcher collects data through documents, observations and/or interviews	Data collected via interviews
Multiple sources of data	Researcher does not rely on a single source	Twelve headteachers interviewed
Inductive data analysis	Researchers build patterns, themes and categories from the 'bottom up'	Researcher worked back and forth with the data to establish themes
Participants' meaning	A focus is maintained on the meanings the participants hold	No hypothesis presented
Emergent design	Research plans are open to change to learning more about the issue	Main study focus emerged from the pilot study findings and changes to national provision for teacher training
Theoretical lens	Researcher may select to view their studies through lenses of culture, gender, race, class or historical, social or political contexts	Social, historical and political contexts were considered in the study
Interpretative inquiry	Researcher makes an interpretation of what they see, hear and understand and this cannot be separated from the researcher's own background	Interpretivism selected as the theoretical framework for the study Reflexivity considered as part of the methodology
Holistic account	Researcher tries to develop a complex picture of the issue	No cause and effect relationships were sought

Creswell (2007:36-39)

Methodology of main study

The methodology selected for this study was a constructivist grounded theory approach, defined by Charmaz (2014:239) as an approach whereby researchers

‘...study *how* – and sometimes *why* – participants construct meanings and actions in specific situations.’

Grounded theory

Grounded theory as a methodology developed in the second half of the twentieth century as social sciences research sought to address tensions between quantitative and qualitative research. It emerged in the 1960s with the work of Barney Glaser and Anselm Strauss, two American sociologists who proposed that a requirement to commence research with a pre-existing theory was not always an appropriate beginning. In some fields such theories did not exist and here it was feasible to discover concepts and generate theory from the field (Robson, 2002). Creswell (2007) charted the development since the 1960s to include subsequent disagreements between the original authors with Glaser distancing himself from what he believed to be Strauss’s overly prescriptive structure.

However Strauss’s systematic approach to grounded theory may be seen as addressing some of the issues of ensuring credibility in subjective research. Strauss and Corbin (1990) advised a system which overlaps in terms of data collection and analysis with the researcher going back and forth into the field to collect data whilst analysing when not in the field. The field is selected by means of theoretical sampling – chosen to best support the research aim. Data collection ends when all possible data is gathered, when the field is saturated. Units of information, called categories, begin to emerge from the data and these categories are explored through a process of constant comparison through a three part system of coding. It is through this detailed analysis of the data that theories are generated. The most

common type of theory will be the local, or *substantive*, theory which closely links to the phenomena being studied. The second theory is a more general *formal* theory which is conceptual and can be further developed for wider use (Denscombe, 2010).

One feature of the Glaser and Strauss (1967) approach was the idea that the researcher should approach the research with as open a mind as possible to avoid any pre-conceived theory generated from the researcher's own experience or from a review of the literature. Doing this should allow the researcher to be open to discovery. Glaser (1978) pursued this approach suggesting the neutral stance of the researcher allowed the meaning which existed in the data to emerge inductively from the constant comparisons in a way which would permit the researcher to develop it into theory. Strauss and Corbin (1990) challenged this, suggesting that it was not possible for the researcher to simply discover the theory –in order to make sense of the data the researcher needed to interpret it and literature could be actively used as long as the researcher took care not to allow it to get in the way of discovery.

In the early stages of planning the methodology for the current research study the Strauss and Corbin (1990) model was identified as a potential research approach, with their later model of a conditional matrix as the coding device dismissed as being overly complicated and inappropriate to the research aims (Strauss and Corbin, 1998). Subsequent reading brought forward the works of Charmaz (2000, 2006, and 2014) on grounded theory.

Charmaz (2000) presented a revised version of grounded theory which she called constructivist grounded theory. This emphasised the flexibility of the method and acknowledged the standpoints of both the researcher and the research participants. In a subsequent work Charmaz (2006:10) stated that within constructivist grounded theory, data were constructed ‘...through our past and present involvements and interactions with people, perspectives and research practices.’ Addressing the issue of the use of literature Thornberg and Charmaz (2011) rejected Glaser’s (1978) view as not being feasible as there could be no neutral stance for a researcher. Instead they developed the approach of Strauss and Corbin (1990) further in acknowledging the role of literature in informing the researcher in order to allow a critical stance toward pre-existing theories, and subject ideas to rigorous scrutiny in the research.

Charmaz (2006) stated it was impossible for researchers to work in a vacuum because they were part of the world in which they were researching. This was an important consideration for this research study as I was researching a subject in which I have experience, interest and in which I work. The challenge for me was to work to a system which supported the trustworthiness of the research approach as advised by Charmaz (2006). Charmaz’s (2000, 2006 and 2014) constructivist grounded theory emphasised the interpretivist approach I had chosen to adopt, highlighting the role of literature in informing the researcher and acknowledging the need for the researcher to reflect on their part in the research, both of which I knew to be important to this research. In fact Corbin (2008) acknowledged that the work of Charmaz (2000, 2006) among others has caused her to reconsider her

stance. She advocated that researchers should be ‘...self-reflective about how we influence the research process and, in turn, how it influences us’ (Corbin and Strauss, 2008:10). In addition she noted the usefulness of an initial literature review to stimulate thinking and inform the researcher to include themes which may help to formulate interview question. The key concern for Corbin was that the researcher took care to look for ‘...examples of incidences in their data and to identify the form that the concept takes in their study’ (Corbin and Strauss, 2008:12). Doing this means the researcher can return to the literature at any point in the study to provide further insight in to the data gathered to confirm or otherwise the findings. As Corbin suggested ‘...bringing literature into the writing not only demonstrates scholarship, but allows for extending, validating, and refining knowledge in the field’ (Corbin and Strauss , 2008:37).

Dourdouma and Mortl (2012) reviewed a range of versions of grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Strauss and Corbin, 1990 and 1998; Rennie, 2000; Clarke, 2005; Charmaz, 2000 and 2006; Bryant and Charmaz, 2011) and concluded that, despite the differences, all versions were concerned with a researcher who intended to generate theory through an exploratory, open-minded study. This does not, however, appear wholly representative of Charmaz’s work as she has suggested that constructivist grounded theory researchers, rather than generate theory, construct theory from their research as this allows them to ‘...investigate in detail....and offer explanatory statements’ which may mean ‘...being eclectic, drawing on what works, defining what first’ (Charmaz 2014:259). To do this constructivist grounded theory promotes the act of theorising which Charmaz

(2014:244) defined as ‘...stopping, pondering and thinking afresh’. This, Charmaz contended, allowed the researcher to be engaged in ‘...seeing possibilities, establishing connections and asking questions’ (*ibid*). Charmaz (2014:260) acknowledged the ambiguity of this approach and she cautioned grounded theory researchers to understand that ‘...theories serve different purposes and differ in their inclusiveness, precision, level, scope, generality and applicability’.

Taking all this into consideration I decided that the methodology for this research project would be best served by being structured around the Strauss and Corbin (1990) model with some modification in terms of the views of Charmaz (2014) and Corbin (Corbin and Strauss. 2008). The plan is presented in Table 3. In constructing the methodology plan I took the advice offered by Corbin that:

‘..tools and procedures are tools, not directives. No researcher should become so obsessed with following a set of coding procedures that the fluid and dynamic nature of qualitative analysis is lost. The analytic process like any thinking process should be relaxed, flexible, and driven by data rather than being overly structured and based only on procedure.

(Corbin and Strauss, 2008:14)

Table 3.2 Summary of the main research design

Procedure	Research Project
Choosing a research problem	The cessation of the GTP, which was the focus of the pilot study, and the professional discussions I was having with Headteachers about the resulting changes to ITT provision led to me reflecting on how the changing landscape of teacher training was being perceived by senior leaders in schools
Choosing a research question	Reflection on the issue led to the question: What do primary school headteachers perceive to be the best way to train teachers who, in their opinion, are fit to teach primary age children?
Literature Review 1	Literature related to the research question provided information, descriptive data, sources for comparison, initial questions for data collection,

Reflexivity	There was on-going self-reflection on the position, perspective and presence of the researcher	
Data Collection	Semi structured interviews with twelve headteachers selected through a set of criteria. Interview questions were open-ended but directed to the research question and responses were followed up to probe the respondents' views and insights. Interviews were recorded and transcribed verbatim.	
Note – The methodology employed a constant comparison method whereby comparisons were made at each stage of the analysis and which proceeded recursively where the theory was progressively refined		
Procedure	Research project	Coding and <i>examples</i>
Initial coding (using memos)	Transcripts of interviews examined line by line to process the raw data and identify indicators of the issues raised by the participants, reducing the data through constant comparison to a set of categories	<p>Headteachers use of 'best', 'good' and 'outstanding' in response to question about how they identify teachers they believe are fit to teach primary age children</p> <p>Identifications of the 'best' teachers, those perceived fit to teach, include professional and personal attributes</p> <p>Trainees need to be in school to practise being teachers <i>'to see what it's really like'</i></p> <p>Not all schools should participate <i>'not pick up on poor practices'</i></p> <p>Schools need a climate which allows trainees <i>'to succeed'</i></p> <p>Trainees need to spend some time away from schools <i>'to study education'</i></p> <p>The BEd route allows trainees time to study theory and practice <i>'good level of theoretical and practical experience'</i></p> <p>The PGCE route is too short to allow the study of theory and practice <i>'it doesn't prepare them for the realities of teaching'</i></p> <p>The SDS route works well as trainees are <i>'being trained by the people doing the job'</i></p> <p>Headteachers perceive they can identify</p>

		<p>potential on meeting teachers and prospective teachers <i>'I know it when I see it'</i></p> <p>Headteachers are looking for trainees who fit their school <i>'the right person'</i></p> <p>The impact of external pressures on schools <i>'a climate of fear'</i></p>
Focused coding (using memos)	Creation of connections between the categories to organise data into a general framework	<p>Perceptions of the attributes of the best teachers</p> <p>Perceptions of the role of practice in teacher training</p> <p>Perceptions of the role of theory in teacher training</p> <p>Advantages and disadvantages of current routes into primary teaching</p> <p>Preferred routes into primary teacher training in a changing landscape</p> <p>Perceptions of what is required in schools to create the climate for successful teacher training</p> <p>Perceptions of what schools cannot provide but are required for successful teacher training and where this provision might be located</p> <p>Perceptions of external pressures which might impact on schools' abilities or willingness to participate in teacher training</p>
Literature Review 2	To explore any concepts emerging from the data but not/or insufficiently covered in the first literature review, to confirm or otherwise the findings	<p>The perception of the ability to identify potential</p> <p>The person who fits</p>
Theoretical coding and theoretical construction	Creation of propositions or statements (substantive theory) which interrelate the categories to construct	The headteachers' identified a range of professional and personal attributes to describe the best teachers and potential teachers and these were more demanding of teachers than those

(using memos)	theory (formal theory)	<p>attributes seen in The Teachers' Standards and in the Ofsted criteria <i>'Beyond the Standards'</i></p> <p>The headteachers perceived they were able to identify the best teachers and potential teachers on meeting <i>them 'I know it when I see it'</i></p> <p>Successful teacher training is comprised of the study of theory and the study of practice <i>'A journey to get them to where you want them to be'</i></p> <p>For the elements of teacher training that took part in school it was the school's responsibility to create a climate which support his <i>'If you've said they can learn how to do their job at your school, then you have to give them the opportunity to succeed and make sure this happens'</i></p>
---------------	-------------------------	--

Adapted from Strauss and Corbin (1990)

Reflexivity

In adopting a constructivist grounded theory approach it was important to heed the guidance of Charmaz (2014:240) who stated that researchers are part of the construction of theory and that this '...fosters researchers' reflexivity of their own interpretations and the implications for them as well as for the research participants.'

Reflexivity was defined by Scott and Morrison (2005: 2001) as '...the process by which the researcher comes to understand how they are positioned in relation to the knowledge they are producing, and indeed, is an essential part of the knowledge producing activity.' Gilbert and Sliep (2012) reviewed the similarities and differences between being reflective and being reflexive. They suggested both

were concerned with positions taken in constructing meaning but that reflexivity had an added quality in terms of interpretation. Frosh and Emerson (2005) concurred with this by identifying reflexivity as a process by which the researcher could test their interpretations and be accountable for how they arrived at meanings for the data.

Day (2012) suggested adopting a reflexive stance in research allowed the researcher to address recurrent issue in qualitative research in terms of underlying assumptions about the production of knowledge. She offered no resolution to the issue but advised that the researcher who was reflexive throughout their research might benefit the most through thinking about who could make claims to know about the subject, asking questions about the identities of those involved and evaluating the trustworthiness of the knowledge produced. Alvesson and Deetz (2000) identified this as researcher identity which they felt was a fluid state subject to alteration throughout the research. This study took the grounded theory approach recommended by Glaser and Strauss (1967) that reflexivity should be an on-going process throughout the research as meanings would be grounded in the empirical findings.

Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000) suggested reflexivity required a researcher to acknowledge and disclose their own self in the research. This was important to my research as I had chosen to do what Ellis and Bochner (2003) describe as starting research from my own experiences. For most of my professional life I have worked in primary schools and have a range of experiences with trainee teachers. Early in my career as a class teacher I worked with trainees who were undertaking teaching

practice with my class. Later I became a school-based mentor to trainees working in other classes in the school. As a headteacher of a primary school I regularly provided school experience for Bachelor of Education (BEd) trainees across all four training years. Since moving to work with trainee teachers undertaking the GTP (SDS) in partnership with local schools I have had reason to reflect on my own assumptions in terms of theory and practice in teacher training, the specific roles of those involved in training and competences measured against external benchmarks. The pilot study allowed me to look at these in greater depth by means of a case study. Sharing the results of that case study with the participants and then with a wider group of colleagues working on the GTP, and in context of national changes to teacher training, led to professional debates on the role that schools may play in training and to my decision to shift the focus of my research to exploring what serving headteachers perceived to be actors which support the training of teachers fit to practise, that is the teachers they sought to employ in their schools.

I intended to study the representations of experience rather than the experience itself (Denzin and Lincoln, 2003). And in doing this I wanted to ensure that this representation was presented in a form with which the potential audience – the headteachers whose voices were represented, other headteachers and those involved in teacher training – could identify and engage, with an aim of presenting shared meanings. Lincoln and Guba (2003) agreed that having both the researcher's voice and the participants' voices – in their own words – in the text calls for reflexivity by which the researcher comes to know themselves within the process of the research. They suggested the researcher reflected on the experiences of the

context that they bring to the research, their research experiences and their experiences in the situation. I have outlined the experiences that I brought to the research; I acknowledged that as a researcher it was essential that I reflected with care on choices made in terms of methodology and research design; and I needed to be aware that the participants in the study were a group with whom I was known professionally and as an ex-headteacher I was familiar with their world.

Robson (2002:172) suggested that when there was a relationship between the researcher and the setting, and possibly also between the researcher and the respondents, it is crucial that the researcher demonstrated awareness of how this could be problematic to the research and that thus a reflexive approach needed to be adopted to guide the researcher. Robson (2002:173) adapted Ahern's (1999) guidance to create a set of ten actions for a researcher to take to use reflexivity to identify areas of potential researcher bias. I applied these strategies to my research, as shown in Table 3.3.

Table 3.3 Using reflexivity to identify areas of potential researcher bias

Guidance	Reflections and action taken by myself (as appropriate)
Write down your personal issues in undertaking the research, consider assumptions and issues of potential power relationships	The research emerged from my own declared experiences and interest. As it was centred on hearing the voices of others, I needed to ensure that I organised the data collection in a manner which that allowed the voices to be heard and that the analysis and write-up were focused on a narrative of the participants' representations of the experience.
Clarify your personal value system and acknowledge areas in which you know	An Interpretivist epistemology was adopted because I sought to explore the

you are subjective	understanding of the participants. I deliberately set out to be transparent in the comprehensive collection and analysis of data so that others could make judgements on the trustworthiness of my interpretations of the findings.
Describe possible areas of potential role conflict	There seemed to be limited power relationship issues in the research. Participants were known to me in a professional capacity. I did reflect on the need to ensure that interviews did not become too cosy (more of a chat than an interview) and used the format of a semi-structured interview to ensure there was focus and structure to the process.
Identify gatekeepers' interests and consider the extent to which they may be favourable to the research study.	One key aspect of government changes to teacher training has been the move to place more responsibility on schools for the training year. Participating in the study allowed the headteachers the opportunity to reflect on and express their perceptions of the roles of schools in teacher training.
Recognise feelings that could indicate lack of neutrality.	Because perceptions were sought this was not an issue. Headteachers were provided with information before agreeing to an interview so that any who felt uninterested in or hostile to the research could decline to participate.
Is there anything new or surprising in the data collection or analysis?	The research design was recursive in nature and allowed for returns to the field to continue the process of checking and refining the analysis.
Where blocks occur can you re-frame them? Do you need additional data?	
Are you quoting some participants more than others? Why?	This was advice I kept in mind during the analysis process to heed against my being drawn to participants with whom I may have felt greater affinity. The coding system adopted ensured each transcription was analysed line by line and used to inform categories.

Consider whether the supporting evidence in the literature really is supporting the analysis.	I strove to maintain a critical stance in terms of using literature to support findings. The opportunity to return to literature to explore outcomes was an integral part of the research design.
Acknowledge the outcomes – do you need to return to the field?	The research design was recursive in nature and allowed for returns to the field to continue the process of checking and refining the analysis.

Robson (2002: 173) adapted from Ahern (1999)

Sampling

The aim of this research study was to explore the perceptions of primary school headteachers and thus it dictated the nature of the sample group. A purposive sample approach was used for the initial sample group with the view that these participants could be used to identify further participants who shared their criteria for participation in the project to form a snowball sample. The key to successfully doing this was in first identifying key participants (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000). Miles and Huberman (1994: 27) noted that qualitative research such as that employing a grounded theory approach often used a small sample of participants selected from ‘...a limited universe.’ The authors continued to offer advice, which I heeded, about the practicalities, relevance and ethics of sampling.

As a researcher I needed to consider what was practical for the research study in terms of my time, workload and access to participants. Charmaz (2006) acknowledged that grounded theory did not necessitate a large number of participants and she suggested that a sample group of twenty participants for interview might be an appropriate target for a grounded theory research design but that the actual number might vary dependent on the study focus. Dworkin (2012)

advised a group between twenty five and thirty in order to achieve saturation but she stressed the importance of researchers, particular inexperienced ones, taking practical considerations into account when making a final decision on numbers.

Guest, Bunce and Johnson (2006), whilst acknowledging that giving an exact number for interview was difficult to do, suggested that twelve interviews could suffice for most researchers. For me it was the practical considerations which became the issue as work and personal commitments were particularly, and sometimes unexpectedly, demanding during the allocated data collection period. For pragmatic reasons of what was feasible in the time available the number of interviews was limited.

It was important to ensure that the sample chosen was relevant to the research question. Primary school headteachers were identified in the research aim and I needed to identify any specific criteria to apply to the selection of headteachers. Creswell (2007:118) advised to search for ‘...a sample group of people who will best inform the researcher about the research problem under examination’. The first criterion was set as being a primary school headteacher. This was identified as leading a school where there were pupils who were in the age band from three to eleven years, the traditional primary age range. As the research was not focused on any phase with that age band this meant the headteachers could come from any of the school types which fell into that band, for example first schools, infant schools, junior schools or primary schools.

Because the research was considering the training of teachers within a changing landscape I decided another criterion should be that the headteachers were serving

headteachers at the time of interview. This meant that the headteachers could offer their perceptions of how the changes might impact on teacher training. At the point of identifying the sample the government were suggesting that teacher training should only take place in schools with Ofsted grades of good or outstanding. In order to gain the perspectives of headteachers who were leading schools the government believed should be participating in teacher training I decided to make having a current Ofsted grade of good or outstanding as a criterion of selection for interview.

As the research focus was on headteachers' perceptions of training teachers fit to practise it was essential that the research sample comprised headteachers who had experience of teacher training in schools and this experience would be as headteachers but could also encompass their experiences of working with trainee teachers before they became headteachers. In order to fully explore and to compare the headteachers' perceptions on teacher training it was crucial for them to have experience of more than one route into teaching. In light of the small number of interviews I felt I would be able to conduct, I decided to only interview headteachers who had experience of all three of the main routes into primary teaching: the BEd, the PGCE and the GTP/SDS.

To summarise the criteria adopted for sampling to meet the research focus were serving headteachers who:

- a. led schools educating pupils in the age band three to eleven years
- b. worked in schools which, at the point of interview, had an Ofsted inspection grade of 'good' or 'outstanding'

- c. had experience of all three of the main routes into primary teaching – the BEd, the PGCE and the GTP/SDS

This set of criteria was used to identify the first participants and a 'snowball' sampling approach was then adopted. The criteria were given to these participants for them to identify further participants who could be approached to participate, thus achieving a snowball sample. Establishing a set of criteria strengthened the ethics of the research by making explicit the grounds for excluding participants and demonstrating that these grounds were practical considerations based solely on the research aim and not on personal characteristics of any headteacher.

This sampling met Charmaz's (2006) description of sourcing relevant material for the research study through finding the people in the field who would provide the data that would help me to address my main research question.

Ethics

In the first stages of planning this research study consideration of the ethics of the study was made. The *Ethical Guideline for Educational Research* (BERA, 2011) underpinned the approach adopted with a view to ensuring the research reached '...an ethically acceptable position from which actions are considered justifiable and sound' (BERA, 2011:4).

The research required the willing participation of a number of primary school headteachers. I needed to apply the principle of informed consent whereby I could ensure that the headteachers '...freely chose to take part [or not] in the research and guarantees that exposure to risk is undertaken knowingly and voluntarily' (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000:51).

Initially four primary school headteachers who had experience of teacher training in their school were each approached. They were known to me in a professional capacity through work supporting trainee teachers in schools. Each headteacher was sent a participant information sheet (Appendix D). The four headteachers were asked if they could identify other headteachers who met the interview criteria. From this a further eight headteachers were identified and all agreed to participate.

Interviews

As this research study focused on the perceptions of headteachers an early consideration was made about the choice of method to gather these perceptions. A questionnaire sent to a large number of headteachers was one option but I decided this was not the most appropriate approach for this study. Having no initial hypotheses meant I had nothing to test with a large number of respondents so felt that a survey of perceptions would not give the depth I was seeking. I was keen to do what Corbetta (2003:265) described as ‘...grasping the subject’s perspective’ in order to seek understanding of the realities of the headteachers’ worlds as they interpreted them.

Patton (1990:290) suggested the qualitative interview provided a framework by which respondents ‘...can express their own understandings in their own terms’. On reflection I see that from the inception of the main study, which was prompted by informal conversations I had had with headteachers on the subject matter, I was interested in continuing these conversations in a more formal manner to explore these voices in more depth. Charmaz (2014:85) advised that interviews worked particularly well in constructivist grounded theory research because they facilitated

‘...an open-ended, in-depth exploration of an area in which the interviewee had substantial experience’. This view, along with that of O’Brien’s (2008) who noted that in-depth interviews with a smaller sample can ask key questions that larger surveys cannot, convinced me that the research study could take place with a relatively small number of participants as long as the participants had substantial experience in the field.

Interviews are the ‘...most common and powerful way in which we try to understand our fellow human beings’ (Denzin and Lincoln, 2003:62). In a grounded theory research such as this study they are, according to the authors, the means of obtaining ‘...a rich, in-depth experiential account’ (ibid:63). As the research aim was to collect data from which theory may be constructed, interviews would allow the participants and the researcher to discuss their interpretations and points of view (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000). This would allow me as the researcher to have the opportunity to explore what each headteacher perceived they ‘...have seen, heard and experienced’ (Rubin and Rubin, 2005:13). Seidman (2006:10) noted that interviews were particularly relevant to educational research as they permitted the investigation of ‘...educational organisation, institution or process through the experience of individual people’. Charmaz (2014:85) contended that in constructivist grounded theory interviews allowed for a focus to be kept on the topic whilst ‘...providing interactive space and time to enable the research participant’s views and insights to emerge’. This required a flexible form of interview to be adopted.

Cohen, Manion and Morrison (2000) advised that the researcher should select the form of interviewing which provided the best fit for the purpose of the research study. As this study sought to understand the participants' perceptions of the topic, and bearing in mind Charmaz's (2014) advice about the need in constructivist grounded theory to adopt a flexible interview method, I decided that semi-structured interviews which use a set of questions to maintain a close focus on the topic in order that it can be discussed in detail would provide the best fit for this research study.

Charmaz (2006 and 2014) offered a framework for semi-structured interviewing in constructivist grounded theory research which I adopted this for the study. This framework comprised six characteristics for me as researcher to follow:

- Select participants who have first-hand experience of the topic
- Undertake an in-depth exploration of the participants' experiences
- Use open-ended questions
- Strive to obtain detailed responses
- Put emphasis on understanding the participants' perspective, meaning and experience
- Follow up on unexpected lines of inquiry, implicit views and accounts of actions

The first characteristic was met through the sampling process. The five remaining characteristics were employed in the creation of the questions to ask and in the execution of the interviews.

I found having a framework to guide me was supportive in developing my understanding of the role of the researcher in the interview process as well as in coping with the interview procedures. Charmaz (2014:70) advised that interviews were ‘...contextual and negotiated’ and they reflected what both the researcher and the interviewee brought to the interview. Researchers have their topics to pursue and participants have their priorities and concerns. Researchers cannot be objective as they are part of the interview process but in being reflexive researchers can address concerns about their subjectivity. In the interview the researcher needed to ask questions which allowed the participant to reflect on their experiences, to listen to the responses and to encourage the participant to talk (Charmaz 2014).

Interview schedule

Designing questions for interviews requires careful consideration as an interview is more than a conversation (Robson 2000). Silverman (2013) cautioned novice researchers not to pose their research question directly to their participants but rather to create a small number of ‘smart’ questions to use as a guide to ensure the participants do most of the talking. Taking all the advice into consideration I designed an initial set of six questions (Appendix E). In addition to the six questions I included the collection of background information to give a context to each interview, something which was missing from the pilot study.

Interviewing, noted Silverman (2013), is a skill and he advised that one of the first things a researcher should do, and particularly a novice researcher, was to pilot their interview schedule. I did this with a deputy headteacher who I have known for

some time, who has had two spells as an acting headteacher, and who has responsibility for supporting trainee teachers in her school. I felt that she had sufficient experience to be able to respond to the questions and she was someone who would do her best to reflect on the process and provide useful feedback to me as a researcher. In addition it meant that I did not 'use up' a headteacher from the main study. I did not interview the headteacher at the same school as she was newly appointed.

Interview process

Taking Silverman's (2013) advice was a worthwhile pursuit as the pilot process provided me with useful and practical feedback. The deputy headteacher said she understood the questions and was grateful for prompts from me when she was unsure whether she has covered all the ground she felt I wanted. This was good feedback for me as it made me reflect on how I had behaved during the interview and whether I had unconsciously suggested that I was looking for certain responses. In discussion it became clear that the deputy wanted to be sure she had provided all the data she could in order to support me with my research. This highlighted for me the interaction, and relationship, between the respondent and the researcher whereby they are constructing knowledge together by means of the interview process (Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000). What I needed to do was ensure my questions were sufficiently structured to focus on the subject and sufficiently open to allow a dialogue fit for the purpose of the research. It was essential that I was ready to ask follow-up questions to probe the initial responses to questions so that I could pursue each respondent's answers by providing '...the interactive space and

time to enable research participant's views and insights to emerge' (Charmaz, 2014). I made amendments to the questions (Appendix F).

Another aspect with which the piloting of the interview process helped me was in recording the interviews. Charmaz (2014) advised recording interviews allowed the interviewer to maintain their focus on the interviewee to support the obtaining of detailed data. In addition listening to the interviews again and transcribing them would be necessary for the data analysis. I had a voice recorder to record the interviews and this was my first opportunity to use it in an interview situation.

Following the interview I played it back to ensure the clarity of recording, transferred the recording to my computer, saved it to several destinations, checked each saved copy several times and then plucked up sufficient courage to delete the interview from the voice recorder.

What I did not do during the pilot was to attempt to transcribe the interview. Many authors, including Denzin and Lincoln (2003), Silverman (2013) and Charmaz (2014), have noted that one of the disadvantages to interviewing is the time and skill required to transcribe recordings. For this research project verbatim transcriptions were essential for the data analysis and as Silverman (2013) pointed out the quality of transcriptions was crucial to success. I took the decision to have each interview professionally transcribed in order to be able to read and make notes on the transcripts whilst listening to the recordings of the interviews and not be overwhelmed with the process (Denzin and Lincoln, 2003). This proved to be a sensible decision as it not only provided accurate records of the interviews, it also supported the creation of memos which were crucial to the data analysis process.

In order to explore the perceptions of the headteachers by means of semi-structured interviews I needed to consider other practical issues. Much of the literature consulted (including Denzin and Lincoln, 2003; Cohen, Manion and Morrison, 2000; Creswell, 2007: and Robson 20002) counselled that interviewing was time-consuming and this indeed proved to be the case. The section considering the ethics of the research study outlined the structure for approaching and informing potential participants and there was a time element to that. However the greater user of time was setting exact days and times for me to visit each headteacher in their school to conduct the interviews. With each headteacher and with me working full-time, finding convenient times took several exchanges of e-mail messages. Even when agreed, circumstances arose where times had to be rearranged due to professional commitments on both sides. For me this proved challenging as I was negotiating with several headteachers around a small number of times I had available and when one sought to change days it impacted on dates given to others.

Data Analysis

In grounded theory research:

‘Analysis is the process of examining something in order to find out what it is and how it works.’

(Corbin and Strauss, 2008: 46)

In this grounded theory research study I used the analysis procedures of Strauss and Corbin (1990), Corbin and Strauss (2008) and Charmaz (2006) in order to examine the data collected. This was achieved by means of memo writing and

coding. Matthews and Ross (2010) acknowledged that the use of memos and coding to find data of interest was an integral part of grounded theory research.

Memos are analytical or conceptual notes. Corbin and Strauss (2008) described them as written records containing the product of analysis – they evidence the researcher's initial thinking about the data. Charmaz (2006) advised researchers, and particularly novice ones, to write memos from the beginning of the data collection cycle and likened it to researchers talking to themselves. Early memos may be brief and contain mostly questions or hunches but as the iterative process of moving back and forth between data collection and analysis gathered pace memos can become increasingly conceptual. Strauss and Corbin (1998) saw them as storehouses of ideas to be sorted and ordered. Charmaz (2006) suggested doing this would allow ideas to develop, connections to be made and gaps to be clearly seen. Much of the literature (Strauss and Corbin, 1990; Corbin and Strauss, 2008; Charmaz, 2006; Creswell, 2007; and Denzin and Lincoln, 2003) offered ideas about what memos might contain but all stressed that there was no single way to do this and that the most important thing was that the researcher adopted a memo writing system which worked for them and which supported their research.

Before embarking on the interviews I made the decision to keep a memo journal. After each of the first interviews I wrote down anything which occurred to me and found that, as advised, these early memos were mainly questions or highlighting something that looked interesting, things which I thought I might need to follow up later in the study. This was also useful in terms of reflexivity as it made me think about how I behaved in the interview and whether I had made every effort to let

the headteacher's voice lead the interview. I believe I became more skilled as the number of interviews increased and recording my thoughts in memo form supported me in doing this. Using the memo journal to support the reflexive aspect of the research was its strength for me as it proved to be, as Charmaz (2006) suggested, me talking to myself and I continued to have these conversations throughout the data analysis process.

Having had the initial interviews transcribed the next step was to begin the process of data reduction through coding which used Charmaz's (2006) adaptation of Strauss and Corbin's (1990) three stage process of initial coding, focused coding and theoretical coding.

Initial coding

Initial coding, which is also known as open coding, sticks closely to the data (Creswell, 2007). It is an open-ended process that should allow new ideas to emerge therefore it is important that the researcher remains open to what the materials suggests. Thornberg and Charmaz (2011: 45) suggested the researcher asks the following questions of the data:

- What do the data suggest?
- From whose point of view?
- What do actions and statements take for granted?
- What processes are at issue here? How can I define it?
- How does this process develop?
- Under which conditions does this process develop?

- How do the research participants think, feel, and act while involved in this process?
- When, why and how does the process change?
- What are the consequences of the process?

I found using this framework of questions supported me to maintain my focus on the data.

Undertaking initial coding meant interrogating the data and this could be done line by line or incident by incident. The incident by incident method is best suited to the use of the researcher's field notes. For this study I had the transcripts of the headteachers' voices and thus the line by line method was more appropriate. After some experimentation I developed a strategy which I found suited me whereby I used A4 notebooks and using double pages I stuck one page of transcript on the left hand side of the notebook and dividing the right hand side into two columns. The first column was used to make notes using the framework of questions. The second column was used for memos. These memos were only about the data on that page of the transcript and were truly conversations with myself as struggled to understand how to interpret the data.

With the first three interviews I was initially tentative with my memos, unsure about what to write as sometimes the things I thought of seemed quite small or even trivial. I worked systematically through each transcript making notes and memos, going back and forth. It was this going back and forth which helped me to appreciate how recursive analysis supports interpretation by ensuring the

researcher maintains their focus on the data. The more I went back and forth, the more focused I was on digging deeper into the transcripts. The memos helped to prompt my thinking, reminded me of considerations I had made previously which I could consider again and refine as appropriate. This process also supported me to understand the time element and challenge to recursive analysis.

As the initial coding stage progressed I became more confident in following the framework for analysis and in writing memos. As I wrote the memos I found that, along with questions, I was writing down initial ideas to be explored further through constant comparison and I began to group these ideas together to form initial codes. These codes were about what aspects appeared to occur most frequently, what was similar and what was different in the data. Where possible I followed Charmaz's (2006) advice about using active verbs (such as identifies, presents, ranks), in the codes to describe what the headteachers appeared to be doing so that I could look for any patterns in the data. I gave these codes broad titles and noted these titles on each interview transcript where they appeared to occur. Some codes appeared on all transcripts, some on some transcripts and some on only a few transcripts. At this point, though, the codes were on twelve separate transcripts and the next stage was to extract these codes to establish whether there was sufficient data to support them.

Focused coding

This led to the second stage of coding which was focused coding. This is where the most frequent and/or significant provisional codes were examined in terms of their adequacy to categorise the data. This is the stage in data analysis where the

researcher makes decisions about identifying and coding core categories in order to explain larger segments of the data (Charmaz, 2006). This second stage of coding proved to be as challenging, if not more than the first stage. It was at this point that I was trying to bring some order and structure to my work, to be able to group initial codes together to create categories which would be general statements about a set of codes which fitted together.

Marshall and Rossman (2010:270) offered their advice that this stage of data analysis could be '...messy, ambiguous, time-consuming, creative and fascinating'. I concurred with all these views. I found this stage messy at the outset as I tried to find systems to bring some structure to the initial codes. I worked through a number of strategies involving sheets of flipchart paper headed with the title of the code and supporting data from the transcripts. I searched for codes which seemed to have aspects in common to see if they could be combined to form a category. Looking at the codes I sometimes went back to the transcripts to look for further explanation which might refine the code and make it easier to link to other codes.

Keeping a close consideration of the research question and on the framework questions for analysis supported me to focus on the data and where codes seemed ambiguous I used the framework questions to support best fit judgements. At times I found myself going back through the transcripts, notes and memos from stage one of the data analysis as well as through the flipchart sheets and tables from stage two. I discovered that using a constant comparison analysis did not just occur within one stage, it encompassed the previous stage. There proved to be no breakthrough moment for me when everything fell into place, rather it was a

steady, focused process where bit by bit categories took on a shape. As shapes began to appear from the mess I could see that order was being brought and I found this rewarding, particularly in terms of my confidence. Data analysis in grounded theory is not a linear process; it is a recursive, inductive process which challenges the researcher to look again, to go back, to reconsider things they may have discarded, to think again about their interpretations and to work in a way which promotes the aim of making sense of the data. This sense should emerge in the final of the three stages of analysis.

Theoretical coding

The final stage was theoretical coding where the researcher specifies possible relationships between categories to ‘...tell an analytical story which has coherence’ (Charmaz, 2006:63). The codes and categories created during the first two stages of analysis were pulled together to allow theorising and the identification of themes. Thornberg and Charmaz (2011) discussed Glaser’s (1967) typology of coding families but advised that constructivist grounded theory did not require analysis to be forced into a framework such as that suggested by Glaser. Rather the researcher should remember that categories can relate to each other in different ways and that theories are ‘...constructed by researchers through their interactions with and interpretations of the field and participants under study’ (Thornberg and Charmaz, 2011: 54). As Charmaz (2006:128) argued, the researcher must embark on the practice of theorising which ‘...entails the practical activity of engaging the world and of constructing abstract understandings about and within it’.

This stage involved drawing the categories together in the way that I wanted to present my research, in how I intended to answer the research question. As with the previous two stages this was not a linear process and it did not come about in an easy manner. To answer the research question I needed to identify and name the central categories in a process of theoretical conceptualisation. In a not dissimilar process to stage two I took the categories which emerged from that stage and considered how they best fitted together. I used flipchart paper to begin to group the categories highlighting aspects they had in common and tensions which appeared when grouping them. This was again an iterative process and subject to development and refinement, and it was time-consuming. Time was consumed not only by going back and forth through the data but also by leaving time to think over and consider the groupings, returning to refine these as I moved towards identifying the key themes. Again there was no one moment when things fell into place, rather it was the steady, measured consideration of the data which brought forward the themes. Through this theoretical coding process I identified three areas of focus. These are presented in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4 Three areas of focus identified as part of the theoretical coding stage

Area of focus	Key elements
Context	<p>Background information on the participants and their schools</p> <p>The participants' identifications of teachers fit to teach primary age children</p> <p>How the national systems the schools were required to use to judge trainee teachers (Teachers' Standards and Ofsted Criteria) compared to the participants' views</p>
Teacher Training	The advantages and disadvantages of the BEd, the PGCE and the SDS routes into teaching

	<p>The route or routes the participants perceived best for primary school teacher training</p> <p>The identification of prospective trainee teachers who were likely to become teachers fit to teach primary age children</p> <p>Training for which a school should be responsible</p> <p>Training which should take place outside of school training</p>
Schools	<p>Creating a climate for teacher training</p> <p>School based mentors and mentoring</p> <p>Resources</p> <p>Outside influences impacting on schools</p>

In reviewing these three areas of focus I was able to identify their descriptive nature and could see that they needed further refinement. I went back, looked again at the various levels of coding and categories and developed these areas of focus. I sought to make sense of the data in a manner which would make sense to others.

I decided that the background information would best be presented as a contextual framework so that the reader could appreciate the value of the participants' voices in responding to the research question and the context in which they did this. This was something that was missing from the pilot study and which in retrospect I can see weakened the study because the reader was unable to contextualise the findings.

Presentation of findings

In seeking to present the remaining areas of focus as theoretical conceptions as well as looking at the groupings of the categories again. Developing these further I

took Charmaz's (2006) advice about going back to the original data collection in the form of the transcripts and noting if any participant said something which stood out and which might conceptualise what was indicated by the data. Corbin and Strauss (2008: Online) described this as '...something so vivid and descriptive that the researcher borrows it'. This proved to be good advice as it reminded me of the actual words of the participants – of their voice. It was also useful to scan again the notes and memos I had made. From this process I took forward a number of quotes from participants and extracts from my memos and used these to support the development and refinement of the areas of focus. This process supported my confidence in identifying the themes for my findings. It also prompted me to use direct quotes from the participants to name the themes.

The findings are presented in this order:

i) Background information

- Background information on the participants and their schools

ii) 'Beyond the Standards'

- The participants' identifications of teachers fit to practise
- How the national systems the schools were required to use to judge trainee teachers (Teachers' Standards and Ofsted Criteria) compared to the participants' views

iii) 'I know it when I see it.'

- Participants' assertions that they are able to spot ability in teachers and potential teachers

iv) 'A journey to get them to where it is you want them to be.'

- The advantages and disadvantages of the BEd, the PGCE and the SDS routes into teaching
 - The route or routes the participants believed produced teachers fit to practise
 - Training for which a school should be responsible
 - Training which should take place outside of school training
- v) **‘If you’ve said they can learn how to do their job at your school, then you have to give them the opportunity to succeed and make sure this happens.’**
- Creating a climate for teacher training
 - School based mentors and mentoring
 - Resources
 - Outside influences impacting on schools

Trustworthiness

In qualitative research the issues of validity, accurate measurement, reliability, and replicability over time, are much discussed. Golafshani (2003), in discussing the use of both terms in qualitative research, summarised that validity has been replaced with the idea of trustworthiness (Mishler, 2000), and reliability by dependability (Lincoln and Guba, 1985).

Denzin and Lincoln (2003) offered a discussion of the application to qualitative research of the quantitative terms of validity and reliability and some relatively recent challenges to this approach. A key part of the discussion applicable to this research study was how researchers involved in interpretivist studies can feel safe

acting on their finding, thus demonstrating the rigour and trustworthiness of the research. The authors proposed that this may be achieved by having a set of three criteria to judge the outcomes and processes of the research in order to assess its authenticity.

The first of these is fairness whereby all those involved in the research should have their voices apparent in the text. This project sought to achieve this by acknowledging the voice of the researcher through reflexivity and a methodology which put the voices of the headteachers at the centre of the data collection and analysis. Verbatim quotes from the headteachers were used in the presentation of findings.

The second was ontological and educative authenticity where the research findings raise awareness of the issues with the participants and those most closely associated with them and the research subject.

The final criterion was catalytic and tactical authenticity whereby the findings could be used to inform change. I aimed to meet the second two criteria by analysing the data by means of a system which allowed theorising to be generated from the data and by following the BERA guidelines in '...communicating my findings, and the practical significance of the research, in a clear, straightforward fashion and in a language judged appropriate to the audience' (BERA, 2011:10).

Glaser (1998) suggested that substantive grounded theory should be judged by its fit, relevance, workability and modifiability. Fitness related to the validity shown in how successfully concepts match what they aimed to represent. Relevance was

about how well these concepts relate to the phenomenon studies and whether they address the concerns of participants. Workability referred to whether the theory works and modifiability to whether the theory could be modified when existing and new data are compared. Critically Glaser (1998) contested that grounded theory can never be wrong or right – it just had variations of fit, relevance, workability and modifiability.

The constructivist grounded theory approach of Charmaz (2006) adopted a similar position in defending the verification of this type of research. Charmaz (2006:131) pointed out that the researcher takes ‘...a reflexive stance towards the research processes and products and considers how the theories evolve and.....both researcher and research participants interpret meanings and actions’. Charmaz (2006) offered her own set of criteria for evaluating the trustworthiness of a research study, under the headings of credibility, originality, resonance and usefulness. Each heading came with a set of questions for the researcher to reflect on in terms of establishing trustworthiness and which I adopted, with some slight amendments for appropriateness to the study. Tables 3.5 to 3.8 list the questions Charmaz (2006:182-183) asked and note where the evidence for meeting these question can be found in the research study.

Table 3.5 Evidence to match Charmaz’s (2006) trustworthy category of credibility

Credibility	
Question	Evidence
Has your research achieved familiarity with the setting or topic?	A comprehensive literature review explores the topic and the discussion of findings is explicitly linked to the review of literature.

Are the data sufficient to merit your claims?	In depth analysis of the interviews created sufficient data.
Have you made systematic comparisons?	The data was analysed by means of constant comparison method.
Do the categories cover a wide range of empirical observations?	The findings are presented in clearly identified themes covering a range of empirical observations.
Are there strong logical links between the data gathered and your argument and analysis?	The format for the discussion mirrors the presentation of findings to ensure strong logical links are made.
Has your research provided enough evidence for your claims to allow the reader to form an independent assessment – and <i>agree</i> with your claims?	The findings are clearly presented to allow the reader to engage with the evidence and the discussion follows a similar presentation pattern to allow the discussion to be considered in light of the evidence. The maintaining of strong logical links between the literature review and the discussion, supported by the evidence of the findings, supports the reader to assess the claims made.

Adapted from Charmaz (2006:182-183)

Table 3.6 Evidence to match Charmaz's (2006) trustworthy category of originality

Originality	
Question	Evidence
Are the categories fresh? Do they offer new insight?	The categories emerged from a recursive analysis of the original data gathered and they offer insight into the headteachers' perceptions in a changing landscape.
Does your analysis provide a new conceptual rendering of the data?	The analysis conceptualises the emergent categories by offering an interpretation of the meaning of the findings.
What is the social and theoretical significance of your work?	It allows the voices of the primary school headteachers to be heard in a changing landscape of teacher training policy.
How does your grounded theory challenge, extend or refine current ideas,	It extends the discussion on teacher training into schools so that the

concepts and practices?	opinions of primary school headteachers can be compared to policy directives and decisions.
-------------------------	---

Adapted from Charmaz (2006:182-183)

Table 3.7 Evidence to match Charmaz's (2006) trustworthy category of resonance

Resonance	
Question	Evidence
Do the categories portray the fullness of the studies experience?	The categories emerged from a systematic, recursive analysis to ensure the fullness of the study has been captured.
Have you revealed taken-for-granted meanings?	The findings and discussion on the emergent categories explore taken for granted meanings.
Does your grounded theory make sense to your participants or people who share their circumstances?	Findings are derived from constant comparison of the interviews and the participants' voices are heard through use of their actual words.

Adapted from Charmaz (2006:182-183)

Table 3.8 Evidence to match Charmaz's (2006) trustworthy category of usefulness

Usefulness	
Question	Evidence
Does your analysis offer interpretations that people can use in their everyday lives?	The analysis interprets the perceptions and views of the headteachers and is constructed in a manner designed to make the analysis accessible, and thus useful, to them.
Do your analytical categories suggest any generic processes? If so, have you examined these for tacit implications?	The headteachers' apparent acceptance of Ofsted grades as indicative of qualification to participate in teacher training is explored for tacit implications, as is the perception of some of the headteachers that they are able to 'spot' good teachers early in meeting them.
Can the analysis spark further research in	The analysis identifies aspects of teacher training provision which may

other substantive areas?	benefit from research.
How does your work contribute to knowledge?	The study contributes to knowledge about headteachers' perceptions how best teachers fit to practise can be trained in a context of changing policy and practice.

Adapted from Charmaz (2006:182-183)

By taking these actions I aimed to meet Hammersley's (1987:67) view that a research study achieves validity, or trustworthiness, if it '...represents accurately those features of the phenomenon that it is intended to describe, explain or theorise'.

Conclusion

The research study adopted an interpretivist approach and used a constructivist grounded theory methodology to explore the experiences of the participants of the studied phenomenon. Participants were selected for their relevance to the study and the need to undertake the research in a ethical manner was fully considered. The role of the researcher was examined through the process of reflexivity. The use of semi-structure interviews was identified as the most appropriate data collection method for the study. The data were analysed through using Charmaz's (2006) adaptation of Strauss and Corbin's (1990) three stage process of initial coding, focused coding and theoretical coding. The theoretical coding stage brought forward the issue of the context for the research study and three themes to be presented as findings. The verification of the research study was addressed using Charmaz's (2006) framework for trustworthiness.

Chapter Four: Pilot Study Summary and Links to Main Study

This chapter comprises a summary of the pilot study to highlight lessons learned and to provide a rationale for the refocus of the main and in the context of a changing landscape of teacher training.

The pilot study was a retrospective case study where key participants in a successful teacher training year were invited to reflect on factors they perceived contributed to the outcome. The successful outcome was that a trainee teacher on the Graduate Teacher Programme (GTP) achieved grades of outstanding in all four categories of the Ofsted grading criteria (2009) used at the time for assessing trainees (Appendix A). The key participants in the case study were: the former trainee, who was then an NQT in the same school; the school-based mentor who supported him in the training year; and the headteacher. Three sets of interviews, conducted over a six month period, were undertaken to allow for recursive data analysis to promote exploration of key categories in greater depth.

As each set of interviews was analysed and explored in further depth in the next set of interviews the crucial role of the headteacher in the successful outcome began to emerge. Table 4.1 records the perceptions of each of the participants of the role of the headteacher.

Table 4.1: Summary of respondents' perceptions of the role of the headteacher

	Headteacher	School-based mentor	Former Trainee
Headteacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Provided time• Used funds appropriately• Ensured SBT was competent• Spoke with SBT and GT• Observed and fed back• Advised, supported, encouraged	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Advised• Made my role possible• Support• Value what I do	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Open• Advised• Warm• Supportive• Made me feel wanted

The headteacher believed it was her role to take a strategic lead in establishing a climate in which the training could thrive. The school-based mentor acknowledged this by noting that it was the headteacher who made her role possible. The former trainee welcomed the support of the headteacher but it was his remark about the headteacher making him feel wanted which was most interesting – he perceived that the headteacher made him feel part of the school and that she welcomed teacher training in her school. There was a sense here of the crucial role of the headteacher in teacher training in the school.

The headteacher believed that each of the participants needed to contribute to a training year and her perceptions are shown on Table 4.2.

Table 4.2: Summary of headteacher's perceptions of the roles of key participants

	Headteacher	School-based mentor	Former trainee
Headteacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided time • Used funds appropriately • Ensured SBT was competent • Spoke with SBT and GT • Observed and fed back • Advised, supported, encouraged 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment to support adult learner • Valued the role • Willing to train • Rigorous with training plan • Consistent in judgements and with external moderations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wanted to be a teacher • Reflected • Open • Listened • Willing to try things • Willing to seek advice • Put the hours in

The headteacher believed the school based mentor's role was: to be knowledgeable about teaching and teacher training; and be willing and able to share that knowledge. The headteacher wanted the trainee to work hard and to be open but she also wanted the trainee to be committed to teaching – to want to be a teacher.

In identifying the three most important contributors to the successful outcome of the training year studied, the headteacher believed these comprised: the school ethos which supported and included all those involved; the selection of a competent and confident school-based mentor who was given time to undertake her role; and the commitment of the trainee to doing his best during the training year.

In reflecting on the findings of the pilot study and particularly on the emergence of the participants' perceptions that the headteacher had played a critical role in the successful outcome of the training year, I began to question my original plan for the

main study. These reflections were supported by proposed changes to teacher training where trainees were to spend more of a training year in school and where schools were to take greater responsibilities for teacher training. Discussions on these changes were a frequent part of my professional life at this time. Originally I had intended the main study would explore the perceptions of experienced members of staff, in a number of primary schools, of how schools could support trainee teachers, focusing on the community of practice involved in the training in the schools. However as a primary school headteacher myself and now a university academic working in the teacher training field I wanted to make the outcomes of my research as useful as possible. I therefore decided to adjust the focus away from the community of practice itself to the context that might facilitate such a community. Therefore I aimed to question headteachers, as lead experts in the community, about contextual issues including:

- Their beliefs on the attributes of teachers they perceive to be fit to practise in their schools
- Their perceptions of the most effective routes to train primary school teachers to be the kind of teachers the headteachers wish to employ in their schools
- What resources and systems they believe a primary school needs to have or create to train teachers
- Whether they believe a primary school can meet all the needs of a trainee teacher and if not what other systems/resources are required

- Their perceptions of the role and use in teacher training of the external benchmarks of the Teachers' Standards and the Ofsted grading criteria for trainee teachers which was used for making judgement on the quality of teaching

The main study used a similar methodology to the pilot study. It was an interpretivist study using a grounded theory approach. The use of semi-structured interviews had been tested in the pilot and found to be an effective way to gather data. The main study took the conclusions of the pilot study in respect of the climate that was conducive to teacher training, which were from one primary school, and probed these in twelve primary schools to explore whether these supported the training of the teachers fit to practise by examining whether the conclusions of the pilot study reflected the perceptions of headteachers in other schools. Data were gathered by means of interviews which were thematically analysed with the aim of creating thick description of participants' experiences and beliefs.

Chapter Five: Main Study Findings

Introduction

The findings begin with a summary of the attributes of the twelve headteachers who were interviewed for this study. This is followed by the presentation of the findings under the four theoretical codes which emerged from the grounded analysis of the data. The links between the theoretical codes, identified in words used by the respondents, and the research objectives are shown in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1 Links between the theoretical codes which emerged from the grounded analysis of data and the research objectives

Theoretical Code	Research Objective
<i>'Beyond the Standards'</i> – the headteachers' perceptions of the attributes demonstrated by their best teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. To explore primary school headteachers' views of what constituted the attributes of the teachers they needed to; ensure the quality of education in their schoolsb. To compare the headteachers' identification of teachers fit to teach primary age children to the Teachers' Standards (DfE, 2011b) which trainee teachers must meet to be awarded QTS and to the Ofsted grading criteria for trainee teachers (Ofsted, 2009) which were in use at the time
<i>'I know it when I see it'</i> – the headteachers' beliefs in their abilities to spot the best teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none">c. To explore the criteria primary school headteachers used to identify potential teachers
<i>'A journey to get them to where it is you want them to be'</i> – the headteachers' perceptions of how best to train primary school teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none">a. To explore primary school headteachers' views of what constituted the attributes of the teachers they needed; and that they thought initial teacher education should be producing

	e. To explore the headteachers' perceptions of the routes into teaching they believed were best suited to the development of primary teachers during initial teacher education
<i>'If you've said they can learn how to do their job at your school, then you have to give them the opportunity to succeed and make sure this happens'</i> – the headteachers' perceptions of the roles and responsibilities of schools participating in teacher training and of external factors which impact on this participation	f. To explore the headteachers' perceptions of the role that schools in the training of teachers fit to teach primary age children g. To explore the headteachers' perceptions of aspects of training that trainee teachers might require to become fit to teach primary age children which they believed schools could not undertake h. To explore the headteachers' perceptions of factors which might impact on a school's participation in teacher training

Each theme is followed by a personal reflection. A consideration of the views expressed by the three headteachers with the most teacher training experience will conclude this chapter.

Attributes of the headteachers

All twelve of the headteachers who participated in the study had experience of teacher training in schools and they all had worked in their schools with trainee teachers on the three main routes to qualification for primary teachers: the Bachelor of Education (BEd); the Post Graduate Certificate in Education (PGCE); and the Graduate Training Programme (GTP). At the time of interviews (2013) the GTP

had just been re-launched as the School Direct Salaried (SDS) route and the respondents used both terms, sometimes interchangeably, when discussing each route. To allow for clarity the term SDS is used unless there was a specific reference to the GTP, with a distinction being drawn to any perceived difference between the GTP and the SDS routes.

The headteachers each had between ten and thirty years' experience of teacher training. These extended periods of experience and the range of training routes in which they had participated meant the headteachers were well placed to reflect on their perceptions of primary teacher training and changes made to the training system. All of the respondents could reflect on changes they had experienced over the last ten years and as serving headteachers could give their views on how those in school perceived the changes to be impacting on schools. Ten of the respondents could consider their experiences of teacher training beyond ten years, with four of these able to look beyond twenty years of training (see Table 5.1 below). This wealth of experience allowed the respondents to: compare the different routes into teaching through which they had supported trainees; identify approaches they believed to be both successful and less successful; and to use their experiences to offer their interpretations of what they perceived current and proposed future developments to teacher training have had and might have on schools (see Table 5.2).

When considering their own routes into teaching seven of the headteachers trained through the BEd route, four through the PGCE and one trained by means of the GTP. Although most trained through the BEd route, a not unsurprising fact given

they were primary school teachers and the BEd route has been the traditional route for those wanting to be primary school teachers, this did provide a range of routes and an opportunity to explore whether their own routes into teaching were influential on their views on teacher training (See Table 5.2).

Ten of the twelve headteachers had more experience of teacher training than they did of headship. This was because they had participated in training taking place in their schools in their roles prior to taking up headship. This gave them additional experiences of supporting and mentoring trainee teachers as class teachers themselves on which they could reflect. The exceptions were respondent three whose involvement in teacher training began when he took up a headship twenty-six years ago and respondent twelve who although he had been a headteacher for thirty-one years his involvement in teacher training had been in the past fifteen years. In terms of headship experience this ranged from two to thirty-one years. This range allowed for perceptions from headteachers who were fairly new to their role to those who had substantial experience and who had seen significant changes in responsibilities delegated to schools and their leaders. As accumulative totals the headteachers had two hundred and thirteen years of teacher training experience and one hundred and thirty three years of headship experience.

At the time of the interviews the Secretary of State for Education, Michael Gove, had stated that trainee teachers should only be trained in schools which held Ofsted grades of good or outstanding. Ten of the headteachers led schools with Ofsted grades of good and two led schools with outstanding Ofsted grades. This meant that these were schools the government believed should be participating in

teacher training as part of a commitment to training the next generation of teachers. The headteachers' responses should be seen in light of this formal evaluation of the quality of practice in their own schools. Table 5.1 presents this background information collected from the respondents.

Table 5.2 Background information on the participants and their schools

Respondent	Own route into teaching	Years as headteacher	Years of ITT experience	School's Ofsted Grade
1	BEd	15	30	Good
2	PGCE	7	10	Good
3	BEd	26	26	Good
4	GTP	5	11	Good
5	PGCE	13	14	Outstanding
6	PGCE	3	14	Good
7	BEd	2	12	Good
8	BEd	7	20	Good
9	BEd	8	30	Good
10	BEd	2	12	Good
11	PGCE	15	21	Good
12	BEd	31	15	Outstanding

In considering the headteachers' teacher training experience all of the respondents were involved in teacher training before the Coalition government's changes to the

training system and this length of experience allowed them to be able to compare systems and to comment on the changes proposed. Six of the headteachers had fifteen or more years' teacher training experience providing them with wider experience upon which to reflect. Of these six headteachers three had over twenty five years' experience of teacher training – what might be considered a generation of teacher training as babies born during these three headteachers' earlier years of teacher training experience could now be qualified teachers themselves. This length of experience covers the movement in the policies of successive governments to give schools a more prominent role in teacher training through requiring Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) to work in partnership with schools. It also covers key landmarks in educational policy to include the introduction of the National Curriculum, the creation of the Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) and the opening up of routes into teaching. A consideration of the views of the three headteachers with the most teacher training experience (respondents one, three and nine) will conclude this chapter. Table 5.3 matches the twelve respondents' years of teacher training experience to key events in teacher training and education policy since 1984.

Table 5.3 Length of respondents' ITT experience matched to key events impacting on ITT since 1984

Respondent -		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1984	Circular 3/84												
1989	National Curriculum												
1992	Ofsted established												
1992	Circular 9/92												
1993	Circular 14/93												
1994	TTA SCITTs												
1997	GTP starts												
1998	Literacy Strategy												
1999	Numeracy Strategy												
2006	Primary National Strategy												
2010	The Importance of Teaching												
2011	Training our next generation												
2012	School Direct and Teaching Schools												
2012	HCEC Great teachers												
2013	NCTL created												
2013	New National Curriculum												
2015	Carter Review of ITT												

‘Beyond the Standards’

At the time of interview, as now, the Teachers’ Standards (DfE, 2011b) were used in teacher training to assess trainees for the award of Qualified Teacher Status (QTS). The guidance issued for the use of the Standards notes that ‘...the professional judgement of headteachers and appraisers is central to appraisal against the Standards’ (DfE, 2011c:6). All twelve respondents confirmed that they were aware of how the Standards should be used and that the Standards were used in their schools to: assess trainees’ progress towards QTS; to set targets; and as the school’s summative assessment of trainees when they completed either their placement or their SDS year at the school. The headteachers had varied views on the impact of these Standards however. Some respondents felt the Standards could be viewed as having to ‘...tick boxes’ (respondents one and eight) and to manage performance (respondents two and five). Other respondents felt the Standards were quite general with respondent three believing them to be ‘...quite bland’, respondent six felt they were becoming ‘...fluffier and fluffier’ and respondent one declaring that in her school she felt they were ‘...beyond the Standards here’. Respondent ten believed that although they were broad they gave trainees ‘...a good steer, a framework for collecting their evidence’.

In addition all twelve headteachers confirmed the Ofsted grading criteria for trainee teachers (Ofsted, 2009) were in use in their schools (Appendix A). Ofsted (2011:27) describe the process for using the criteria to be one of working alongside national Standards for teachers so that the criteria help providers to ‘...make judgements about trainees working at higher levels: that is, above the threshold level of the

Qualified Teacher Status Standards'. To do this, judgements were made using the Ofsted (2009) criteria on four elements of a trainee's practice: their teaching; their evidence files; their explanations; and their notable characteristics. In order for the trainee to be judged as either good or outstanding (and thus above the satisfactory grade which indicated meeting the Teachers' Standards) the trainee needed to be judged to be demonstrating either good or outstanding performance '...at this level across all four groups' (Ofsted, 2011:28). This was before changes to Ofsted judging procedures which replaced the term 'satisfactory' with 'requires improvement'. Ofsted (2011:28) noted that these four groups indicated characteristics of '...the quality of teachers in training, not those of qualified practitioners'. However these criteria were, at the time of interview, being phased out but were still being used by teacher training providers whilst awaiting new guidance from Ofsted on the move to have one set of criteria for teachers and trainee teachers. Several respondents mentioned this and believed there should be one set of criteria only (respondents one, two, three, four and six), exemplified by respondent six who noted '...a good lesson is a good lesson whoever teaches it'. The headteachers described the Ofsted criteria as being used as part of feedback on lesson observations and to judge lessons, as noted by one who said '...they're good for making judgements' (respondent eight).

In order to enable an analysis of the respondents' perceptions of 'good' and 'outstanding' teachers and trainees, that is those perceived to be fit to practise in their schools, an analysis of the Teachers' Standards and the Ofsted criteria was undertaken. A framework of analysing the documents was established in terms of

highlighting the descriptions given of the actions a teacher should undertake to meet the standards and the actions required to attain a satisfactory grade using the Ofsted criteria which Ofsted note as indicative of meeting the Standards. In addition the Ofsted criteria descriptions used in judging outstanding performance of trainee teachers were also included in order to provide a wider comparison to the interviewed headteachers' perceptions of teachers fit to practise which follows the analysis of the Standards and criteria. When analysing the actions described in the Standards and the criteria three categories emerged: the critical thinking skills required to carry out the job of a teacher; the actions of a teacher; and the personal qualities present in teachers. These findings are presented in Table 5.4.

Table 5.4 An analysis of the Teachers' Standards and the Ofsted Grading Criteria

	Teachers' Standards		Ofsted Criteria Satisfactory		Ofsted Criteria Outstanding
Critical thinking	challenge		reflect		challenge
	reflect		understand		create
	critically understand		secure		link
	adapt		knowledge		adapt
	securely know		evaluate		change
			apply		analyse
					innovate
					risk
					overcome
What a teacher does	teach	involve	teach	include	capture
	assess	account for	assess	take	guide
	plan	promote	plan	account	
	know	impart	know	progress	
	guide	knowledge	feed back	evidence	
	feed back	act	monitor	ensure	
	monitor	develop	use		
	use	be aware	manage		
	manage	maintain	deploy		
	deploy	establish			
		set			
Personal qualities	responsible		responsible		having rapport
	communicative				appreciative
	positive				flexible
	respectful				enthusiastic
	encouraging				inspiring
	valuing				
	having regard				
	contributing				

Table 5.4 shows a number of common descriptions between the standards and the Ofsted criteria. In terms of critical thinking the Ofsted criteria appeared to demand more of the teacher at the satisfactory level and particularly at outstanding which included higher order skills such as creating, innovating and being able to overcome barriers. The criteria also promoted risk taking as a desirable attribute seen in the best teachers. The category of what a teacher does followed what might be called the cycle of teaching – planning, teaching and assessing – and the two documents presented similar approaches here. Organisational skills were highlighted in both documents with the need for teachers to manage, deploy, maintain and set. There was a similar pattern in the personal qualities with the description of the need for teachers to demonstrate responsibility being common to both sources, although the Ofsted criteria placed most of their personal quality descriptors in the outstanding band. Overall there was some consistency between the Standards and the criteria, particularly in what it is that a teacher does. The Ofsted criteria appeared to be the more demanding of the two documents in terms of critical thinking skills, even at the satisfactory level. The Standards contained more of the personal qualities than the criteria at the satisfactory stage but this may be explained by the fact that they represented a broader summary of expectations of teachers whereas the purpose of the Ofsted criteria was to make judgements about how well trainee teachers were performing. There are two phrases which stand out in this analysis. The first is present in both documents in the use of ‘securely know’ in the Standards and ‘secure knowledge’ in the criteria. This suggests that the knowing or the knowledge required of a teacher is measureable and identifiable.

The second phrase appears in the Standards and is 'impart knowledge'. The word teach is already used in the Standards suggesting that impart might be slightly different – perhaps sharing, or passing on, the secure knowledge. In a centralised curriculum this may mean the body of knowledge identified in this curriculum imparted in the manner prescribed.

Respondents' identification of the attributes of teachers fit to practise

The question posed to the headteachers was about how they identified the best teachers used the term outstanding teachers. This question was probed in each interview to explore the headteachers perceptions of the attributes they identified in teachers fit to teach primary age children. The analysis of the transcripts of the interviews revealed that in responses many of the headteachers included the phrases 'outstanding teachers', 'good and outstanding teachers', 'good teachers' and 'the best teachers' in their descriptions. There seemed to be slipping between what might be viewed as Ofsted terminology of outstanding and of good in making judgements on the performance of teachers but it was clear that the headteachers were describing what they perceived to be the teachers fit to teach primary age children and thus the kind of teacher they wanted to see in their schools. To accommodate the range of vocabulary used by the respondents this section uses the phrase 'good teachers' to describe the teachers the headteachers believed fit to be employed in their schools.

In their descriptions of the attributes they believed good teachers demonstrated, in addition to the terms which matched those used in the Teachers' Standards and in the Ofsted criteria, the respondents used a range of other descriptors. An analysis

of the descriptors given by the headteachers allowed them to be grouped into key attributes. These key attributes were identified as: critical thinking; commitment; collaboration; courage; being industrious; being orderly; being persuasive; being receptive; and being knowledgeable. An overview of these attributes is presented in Table 5.5, which is followed by a more detailed presentation of each of the categories of attributes identified by the headteachers. This is followed with a comparison of the descriptions of the analysis of the Teachers' Standards and the Ofsted criteria matched to the descriptions given by the headteachers. The final part of this section is an analysis of the attributes the headteachers reported that they looked for in potential teachers.

Table 5.5 Headteachers' identification of the attributes of teachers fit to practise

Attribute	Actions from that attribute
Critical thinking	reflecting observing assessing questioning adapting thinking analysing applying calculating challenging criticising examining seeking solving understanding
Commitment	committing being passionate valuing enjoying enthusing expecting giving promoting welcoming desiring concerning making a difference going the extra mile
Collaboration	supporting team playing considering contribute discussing including liaising sharing
Courage	changing trying challenging criticising questioning risking having the nerve
Being industrious	creating ensuring managing organising planning preparing working (hard) establish
Being orderly	organising planning preparing
Being persuasive	engaging encouraging inspiring motivating involving promote
Being receptive	listening asking willing adopting flexible
Being knowledgeable	knowing learning remembering identifying

Critical thinking

It was the attribute categorised as critical thinking, or perhaps higher order thinking, which provided the most descriptions by the headteachers of the actions of the good teacher. Having the ability to reflect on their practice was identified as '...looking to improve themselves through reflection' (respondent two), '...being a reflective practitioner' (respondent seven) and as '...being able to develop so that you take criticism on board in a good way, a positive way, and reflect on it and move on' (respondent five). Respondent eight believed this was a teacher who was '...reflecting on every aspect of their role'. It was this level of independent thinking which was evident in the other actions. Respondent one believed these teachers '...asked questions to delve deeper' and respondent six suggested they '...think about what they need to do' and this leads them into '...analysing their practice and if it doesn't work they try something different'. Respondent seven noted that good teachers were able '...to observe other teachers but not to be that teacher but to identify good practice and adapt it and adopt it and take it on'. In the classroom good teachers were '...constantly assessing' (respondent two) and having '...assessment at the core of most of what they do' (respondent eight). This led them to be able to '...challenge every pupil' (respondent four), '...seeking solutions' (respondent six), '...examining things in detail' (respondent nine) and '...being critical of things and being driven by the needs of the children and not by any national agenda' (respondent six).

Commitment

Being committed to the teaching profession and to being a teacher was the second most frequent response from the headteachers. Respondent eleven felt commitment meant good teachers see teaching as '...not just a job', with respondent seven describing teaching as more than a job or a career '...it's a calling really' and respondent twelve '...a vocation'. Respondent five believed those committed to teaching '...really wanted to do it' and respondent one suggested that these were teachers for whom '...the school is part of their life'. Respondents ten and eleven described them as being passionate about teaching. The good teachers valued those they worked with and demonstrated this by the manner in which they '...promoted the school ethos across the whole school' (respondent three) and '...welcomed people to their classroom' (respondent two). This could be seen in their '...enjoyment of teaching' (respondent seven) because '...they were keen to be there in the school' (respondent eight). Respondent nine believed good teachers wanted '...to make a difference' and that they were '...concerned with the bigger picture and willing to go that extra mile'.

Collaboration

The ability to work with others is an attribute the best teacher has according to the respondents. This manifests itself in '...supporting each other' (respondents four and five), '...engaging with other staff' (respondent one) and '...discussing with others' (respondent two). Respondent eight suggested good teachers were '...part of a team supporting the children'. Respondents three, four, seven and eleven noted that good teachers were '...team players'. Respondent three believed being a

team player meant being ‘...willing and able to share with other colleagues’ and respondent two described this as ‘...being part of the whole school’.

Courage

The intellectual attributes of challenging, criticising and questioning were mirrored in the attribute of being courageous where risk taking was described as ‘...doing it differently if need be’ (respondent one), ‘...willing to take a risk’ (respondent two), ‘...thinking outside the box (respondent six), ‘...looking for new ways to do things’ (respondent seven) and ‘...not being scared to try’ (respondent eleven). Respondent four described this as a teacher ‘...who brings me solutions not problems’ and this seems to provide a summary of the views expressed.

Being industrious and orderly

The attributes of being orderly and industrious were important to the headteachers and may also link back to the teacher who finds solutions because the respondents were looking for teachers who could independently organise and prepare the learning in their classrooms, ‘...be prepared to teach good lessons’ (respondent one) and then actually do all the things they needed to do and do these on time, ‘...work hard’ (respondent nine), ‘...create resources (respondent six) and have child friendly organisation’ (respondent ten). Good teachers were able to manage their classes and their classrooms to include ‘...behaviour management’ (respondent nine).

Being persuasive

Good teachers uses their persuasive skills to engage pupils (respondents one, three, four, five, eight, twelve). Respondent three exemplified this in saying ‘...they are

able to engage all the pupils in their class'. This should '...encourage' (respondents one, three and four), '...inspire' (respondent three and six), '...motivate' (respondent four) pupils and all pupils in the class should be '...included' (respondent eight).

Being receptive

Respondents described good teachers as being able to take actions such as listening (respondents one, five and eight), asking (respondents one and four) and being willing (respondents two, three and five). Respondent one believed it '...was about really listening' and respondent five believed good teachers demonstrated '...a willingness to develop'.

Being knowledgeable

The good teacher knows about a number of aspects of being a teacher – '...knows their subject knowledge inside out' (respondent four), '...knows their subject knowledge and has this to the forefront' (respondents eight) '...knows the curriculum' (respondent seven), '...knows each child individually (respondent eight) and '...knows how to promote learning' (respondent six). The teacher is '...able to learn from their experiences' (respondent two) and is '...dynamic in their own learning' (respondent six). They are able '...to remember all those things they need' (respondent one).

Comparison to Teachers' Standards and Ofsted criteria

To support the comparison of the views of the headteachers on the attributes and actions of good teachers to the descriptions in the Teachers' Standards and the Ofsted criteria three tables are presented. Table 5.6 repeats the descriptors taken

from the Teachers' Standards and the Ofsted criteria and compares this to the descriptors used by the headteachers. Words and phrases used by the Standards and the criteria but not used by the headteachers are crossed out. Table 5.7 repeats Table 5.5 which gave the headteachers' identifications of the attributes of good teachers but crosses out any descriptors which do not appear in the Standards. Table 5.8 repeats Table 5.5 which gave the headteachers' identifications of the attributes of good teachers but crosses out any descriptors which do not appear in the Ofsted criteria. An analysis of these comparisons follows the presentation of Tables 5.6, 5.7 and 5.8.

Table 5.6 The analysis of the Teachers' Standards and the Ofsted Grading Criteria matched to the headteachers' descriptions of teachers fit to practise

	Teachers' Standards	Ofsted Criteria Satisfactory	Ofsted Criteria Outstanding	
Critical thinking	challenge reflect critically understand adapt securely know	reflect understand secure knowledge evaluate apply	challenge create analyse adapt link change innovate risk overcome	
What a teacher does	teach assess plan know guide feed back monitor use manage deploy	involve account for promote impart knowledge act develop be aware maintain establish set	teach assess plan know feed back monitor use manage deploy include take account progress evidence ensure	capture guide
Personal qualities	responsible communicative positive respectful encouraging valuing having regard contributing	responsible	having rapport appreciative flexible enthusiastic inspiring	

Table 5.7 Headteachers' descriptions of the attributes of teachers fit to practise matched to the Teachers' Standards

Attribute	Actions from that attribute
Critical thinking	reflecting observing assessing questioning adapting thinking analysing applying calculating challenging criticising examining seeking solving understanding
Commitment	committing being passionate valuing enjoying enthusing expecting giving promoting welcoming desiring concerning making a difference going the extra mile
Collaboration	supporting team playing considering contributing discussing including liaising sharing
Courage	changing trying challenging criticising questioning risking having the nerve
Being industrious	creating ensuring managing organising planning preparing working (hard) establishing
Being orderly	organising planning preparing
Being persuasive	engaging encouraging inspiring motivating involving promoting
Being receptive	listening asking willing adopting flexible
Being knowledgeable	knowing learning remembering identifying

Table 5.8 Headteachers' descriptions of the attributes of teachers fit to practise matched to the Ofsted grading criteria

Attribute	Actions from that attribute
Critical thinking	reflecting observing assessing questioning adapting thinking analysing applying calculating challenging criticising examining seeking solving understanding
Commitment	committing being passionate valuing enjoying enthusing expecting giving promoting welcoming desiring concerning making a difference going the extra mile
Collaboration	supporting team playing considering contributing discussing including liaising sharing
Courage	changing trying challenging criticising questioning risking having the nerve
Being industrious	creating ensuring managing organising planning preparing working (hard) establishing
Being orderly	organising planning preparing
Being persuasive	engaging encouraging inspiring motivating involving promoting
Being receptive	listening asking willing adopting flexible
Being knowledgeable	knowing learning remembering identifying

There was a broad level of agreement amongst the headteachers, the Standards and the criteria, with many of the same or similar terms used by each. There were

nine direct matches amongst the groups. Three of these occurred in the critical thinking category: challenge; reflect; and adapt. This suggests teachers who are able to reflect on situations and to use their skills to solve problems. The other six matches occurred in the category of what a teacher does, with teach, assess and plan being noted by all groups. In addition teachers needed to know, to use and to manage, suggesting knowing about teaching and being able to apply this knowledge and manage their classrooms. In looking at how the descriptors used by the headteachers matched to the Standards and then to the criteria there was a fifty-eight percentage direct match to the Ofsted criteria and a forty-eight percentage direct match to the Standards. There is no specific conclusion to be drawn from this because the headteachers used a wide range of descriptors and there are similar ideas expressed without being direct matches. However one category does appear to show a stronger match than the others and this is between headteachers and the Ofsted criteria in the critical thinking category. Here ten out of the fourteen descriptors used by Ofsted were also used by the headteachers suggesting at the least a common language in use and perhaps a level of agreement on the attributes of good teachers: that is those fit to practise. The headteachers' views on the role of Ofsted in inspecting schools will be returned to later in this chapter.

A consideration of the headteachers' descriptors matched to the Standards (Table 5.7) and to the Ofsted criteria (Table 5.8) shows how much more depth and breadth there was in the headteachers' descriptions and how this separated out the three Ofsted categories which emerged from analysis of the Standards and the Ofsted criteria to the nine categories of the headteachers' descriptors. It could be argued

that some of the headteachers' descriptions fleshed out the Standards and the Ofsted criteria – they interpreted these to show what they looked like. But it appears to be more than this – the headteachers identified fifteen critical thinking attributes that they believed were seen in good teachers, yet the Ofsted criteria demanded only seven of these and the Standards demanded five of them. A commitment to teaching was the second most important factor to the headteachers yet there are only two matches to the Standards and no matches at all to the Ofsted criteria. This pattern continued in the other categories. One explanation is that the headteachers are more demanding in their Standards than the Teachers' Standards and the Ofsted criteria. Another explanation is that the headteachers were able to unpick to a much finer detail what it was the good teachers did in the school and in the classroom and that this went beyond that which could be captured in Standards or criteria.

Attributes looked for in potential teachers

Following on from their views on the attributes of good teachers the headteachers were asked about what they looked for in potential teachers or trainee teachers at the beginning of their training. The respondents identified the attribute of being committed to teaching and some of the respondents noted that they were looking for academic ability identified through qualifications, although other respondents believed these qualifications were not necessarily good indicators of the potential to be a good teacher.

Seven respondents were looking for a commitment to teaching and they linked this to trainees who knew that they wanted to be teachers, with respondent seven

looking for a trainee ‘...who really wants to do it’, respondent five believing they needed to be ‘...someone who’s really reflected on why they want to be a teacher’, respondent two suggesting this means ‘...they go into it for the right reason’ and summarised by respondent ten who looked for ‘...commitment, just commitment really’. One headteacher said she was not looking for skills in prospective teachers because they would learn these through training but that she was just looking at ‘...all the qualities, like manner, enthusiasm, humour and passion’ (respondent eleven).

Despite the descriptions of good teachers being led by critical thinking attributes only four respondents mentioned they would look at academic skills in potential trainee teachers, with one noting that she looked for ‘...an education related degree’ (respondent one) and another taking a broader view by declaring ‘...if I don’t see As and Bs and A stars, they are going in the bin’ (respondent four), and with respondent seven similarly suggesting she was looking for ‘...good GCSE and A level grades’. One headteacher noted that the PGCE, which requires a first subject degree, meant trainees had ‘...followed a subject in depth academically’ (respondent five). Two respondents suggested academic qualifications were not their main focus when considering potential teachers with respondent three declaring ‘...qualifications don’t necessarily make a good teacher’ and respondent ten noting she looked for ‘...practical intelligence’ rather than specific grades. Some of the respondents declared they were not so concerned with qualifications because through their training the trainees ‘...will learn’ (respondents one, four and ten). Respondent four appeared to have considered both as he declared he was

looking for academic qualifications in potential trainees and believed with these in place '...the rest I can build myself'.

Reflection

In reflecting on the years of teacher training experience the headteachers have I find myself drawn to the three who have been participating in teacher training in schools, as I have, for more than twenty-five years (respondents one, three and ten). This means involvement in teacher training before the introduction of the National Curriculum, before the creation of Ofsted and when the vast majority of primary teachers were trained by means of the BEd route where most of their training was spent outside of schools. The breadth of experience these three headteachers have interests me and I have decided to return to their interviews as the final section of this chapter to explore any similarities and differences which their experiences offer and to reflect on whether there are links to my own experiences.

That all twelve headteachers have teacher training experience predating the collation government and the changes introduced or announced for future introduction is also interesting as it allows them to be able to compare systems and proposed systems from the viewpoint of experience.

The headteachers views on the use of the Teachers' Standards are much as I have experienced when visiting schools supporting the training of teachers where they seem to me to be largely in use as a form of tick list where the focus is on meeting the standard – that is ticking it when it is seen to be done. But what I hear more often in schools is not the language of the Standards but rather the language of

Ofsted and I hear this most frequently from the headteachers. The headteachers' descriptors categorised here were gained from interviews where the respondent was speaking in response to a question which they had not received in advance so their responses were their immediate thoughts and reflections. I speculate that if I had asked the headteachers to provide a written account of what they perceived good teachers did this too would demonstrate links to the Ofsted criteria. So I am not surprised that there were similarities between the headteachers' descriptions of good practice and those of Ofsted. I think this is part of the complex relationship between schools, especially their headteachers, and Ofsted and this relationship is explored further in this chapter and in the next chapter. I am also not surprised that the headteachers described good practice beyond the descriptions seen in the Ofsted criteria because that is also what I have experienced in schools in conversations with headteachers about trainee teachers where they have unpicked feedback to analyse precisely what they believe the trainee needs to do next in terms of developing as a teacher and then constructed this in a way that the trainee can understand and use.

‘I know it when I see it’

This theme emerged with declarations from some of the headteachers that they had the ability to identify the qualities of good teachers very early on in meeting them – *I know it when I see it*. This was carried through to the respondents’ perceptions of potential teachers where, although they identified commitment to teaching and academic qualifications as desired attributes, the most important attribute of a trainee teacher to the headteachers was that of being *the right person*. The respondents believed they could identify this rightness, although many of them struggled to put this into words. The respondents’ perceptions of their ability to spot the attributes in teachers and potential teachers are presented here. The section concludes with a personal reflection.

Knowing it when I see it

In exploring the headteachers’ views on how they identified teachers they believed were fit to teach in their schools, a number of the respondents stated their ability to be able to *spot* quality in teachers early in meeting them. Respondent four exemplified this in suggesting:

‘I do a lot of interviewing. I have over the years and I can tell you now you can spot an outstanding teacher within minutes of meeting them. Half the time I don’t even have to see them teach to back my judgements and what is really interesting is that I haven’t been wrong yet.’

The belief that such teachers were identifiable on meeting them was a recurrent theme in the interviews, with eight of the twelve headteachers making reference to the view that they were able to so this (respondents one, four, five, seven, nine, ten, eleven, twelve). They based this ability on their professional experiences of being a teacher themselves, of observing teachers and of being a headteacher

(respondents four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten). Four of the respondents noted that the 'best' teachers had '...a presence' about them (respondents five, nine, eleven, twelve), with respondent five noting '...one of the first things I do is look for a presence and it's hard to define that but I do think you sort of instantly almost have that feeling'. Similarly, respondent eleven noted '...I know instinctively', respondent ten believed '...you know, you can see it' and respondent twelve '...I know very quickly'. Respondent five said she identified teachers fit to practise as '...the people I want to work with' and respondent eleven felt it was '...someone that makes me want to listen to them'.

Trainee teachers - the right person, the person who fits

In a link to their descriptors of teachers fit to practise and their belief that they were able to spot this in teachers, some of the headteachers believed they could spot the potential to be a 'good' teacher in prospective teachers. This potential was predominately about the idea that the trainee was 'the right person'. The other attributes the headteachers looked for was a commitment to teaching and academic ability.

Nine of the twelve headteachers declared they looked for the *right person* to go into teaching with respondent five acknowledging '...you just kind of know really don't you, and I know that's not very professional or whatever, but you just kind of have a feeling, that person, I can see in front of a class of children and they will engage those children and they will care for those children'. Respondent eleven suggested she would '...know after a couple of meetings, a lot of it is gut feeling which is not very good'. It is interesting that both respondents, who are

experienced headteachers, should feel the need to defend their statements.

Similarly respondent one, who has over thirty years ITT experience and fifteen years of headship, declared she was looking for ‘...someone who will fit with our school’ but goes on to acknowledge ‘...it’s about them as a person but I can’t get right down to what that means is the right person’. The phrase *right person* was used by four of the headteachers to describe the trainee they were looking for (respondents one, two, three and twelve). This *rightness* was also expressed this in terms of fit, with respondent one wanting ‘...someone who will fit the ethos of our school’, respondent four looking for ‘...someone who will buy in to the school ethos’ and ‘...they need to fit – people who aren’t going to be taken into the fold then it’s going to be a no from the start’ (respondent ten).

Reflection

The headteachers’ assertions that they can identify quality in teachers and potential teachers could prove to be problematic in recruiting trainee teachers in teacher training which is led by schools. The sense that the headteachers believe they are looking for the right person for their school, the person they feel they can train to be the type of teacher they will then seek to employ suggests that the headteachers’ overarching concern is their school rather than their profession. They may be looking to train teachers they can employ in their own schools rather than to train teachers to be employed in the profession. This contrasts somewhat with their identification of good teachers where critical thinking and a commitment to teaching are their first two desired attributes. A teacher or trainee possessing these attributes – the commitment to being a teacher coupled with the ability to

independently apply critical thinking - may well have the ability to be a teacher irrespective of the school in which they are employed or are in training. I wonder if this is what the headteachers actually see – the teacher identity or the being a teacher – and, as experienced and senior teachers, they believe know it when they see it. Nonetheless there is tension here – the headteachers, as part of their role, will be aware of the existing frameworks for appointing staff and for allocating training places, and they make no suggestions that these require changing, but they appear to be allowing their own belief systems to show through.

‘A journey to get them to where it is you want them to be’

The third theme emerged from the respondents’ perceptions of how trainee teachers should be trained. The title of the theme is taken from a comment by respondent ten as it provides an effective summary of the views of the other respondents – they considered how best to train the teachers that they would then be happy to employ, the trainees would be where the headteachers wanted them to be. When asked to consider how best they felt primary school trainees could be trained the respondents did this predominantly by reflecting on aspects of the routes into teaching with which all twelve respondents had experience – the BEd, the PGCE and the SDS (GTP). This was important to this study because, in a changing landscape of teacher training provision, it captured the voices of these headteachers in terms of what they felt worked, so perhaps needed preserving, and what they felt did not work, and thus may benefit from change. This allowed a comparison to be made between the views of these headteachers and recent government changes, and proposed changes, to teacher training policy. This is

presented as the advantages and disadvantages they believed to be present in the routes (Tables 5.9 and 5.10). The findings are presented matched to the respondents' own routes into teaching to allow consideration of any influence of their own route on their perceptions of the advantages and disadvantages of the three routes.

Table 5.9 Headteachers' identification of the advantages of routes into teaching against their own route into teaching

Own Route	Advantages BEd	Advantages PGCE	Advantages SDS
BEd (Interviews 1,3,7,8,9,10,12)	<p>Time to develop understanding education (1, 7, 8, 9, 10)</p> <p>Lots of practice (1, 3, 7, 8, 9)</p> <p>Lots of theory (1, 3, 7,8, 10)</p> <p>Committed to teaching (8, 10)</p>		<p>More time in school (1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12)</p> <p>Practical experience (1, 3, 7, 8, 9,10, 12)</p> <p>Good for those with experience already (3, 7, 9)</p> <p>School takes lead on training (3, 12)</p> <p>Helps with local recruitment (3, 10)</p>
PGCE (Interviews 2,5,6,11)	<p>Time to develop understanding education (2, 5, 6,)</p> <p>Lots of practice (2, 5, 6, 11)</p> <p>Lots of theory (2, 5, 6, 11)</p> <p>Committed to teaching (5)</p> <p>Develop understanding of workload (2)</p>	<p>Intensive year so understand workload (5, 6,)</p> <p>Have already undertaking a 3 year degree course (5)</p> <p>In depth academic study (5)</p> <p>Gain experience of a wide range of age phases (2)</p>	<p>More time in school (2, 5, 6, 11)</p> <p>Practical experience (2, 5, 6, 11)</p> <p>School takes lead on training (2, 5, 6, 11)</p> <p>Helps with local recruitment (6)</p>
GTP (Interview 4)			<p>More time in school</p> <p>Good for those with experience already</p> <p>School takes lead on training</p>

Table 5.10 Headteachers' identification of the disadvantages of routes into teaching against their own route into teaching

Own Route	Disadvantages BEd	Disadvantages PGCE	Disadvantages SDS
BEd (Interviews 1,3,7,8,9,10,12)	<p>Trainees allocated to schools who have no choice (1, 3, 10)</p> <p>School has to fit provider's schedule (1, 3)</p>	<p>Too short on practical experience (1, 7, 9)</p> <p>Too much theory over a short time (1, 3, 8, 9 10)</p> <p>Trainees allocated to schools who have no choice (1, 3, 10)</p> <p>May not really want to teach (9, 10)</p> <p>Inappropriate subject degree (1)</p> <p>Not suitable for primary teaching (1)</p>	<p>Financial cost to school (9)</p> <p>Needs to be the right person (3)</p>
PGCE (Interviews 2,5,6,11)	<p>Begin training at a young age/lack of life experience (5)</p>	<p>Too short on practical experience (2, 6)</p> <p>Too much theory over a short time (2, 5, 6)</p> <p>Insufficient time to develop reflective practice (6)</p>	<p>Financial cost to school (5)</p> <p>Only works in good schools (2)</p> <p>Strain on school to provide level of support required (5)</p> <p>Less theoretical study (6)</p> <p>Requirement to employ (6)</p>
GTP (Interview 4)	<p>Begin training at a young age/lack of life experience</p> <p>Trainees allocated to schools who have no choice For those who can't get on a subject degree course</p>	<p>Too short on practical experience</p> <p>May not really want to teach</p>	

An analysis of these findings suggested that the most important factors in successful training, according to the headteachers were: opportunities and time for trainees to practise teaching; opportunities and time for trainees to study theory related to teaching; the commitment demonstrated by trainees to becoming a teacher; and that the opportunities to practise teaching and to study teaching were led by bodies best placed to take responsibility for these aspects, to include the relationship between these bodies. These factors are presented and are followed by the headteachers' choices of their preferred route or routes into primary teaching which are analysed against the factors they identified as most important to successful training.

Practice

In analysing the respondents' perceptions of practice five issues emerged. These were: practice allows trainees to learn on the job: trainees get to see what teaching looks like: they are trained by people who are actually doing the job, practitioners; trainees can engage in professional dialogue with practitioners: and these practitioners provide role models for trainees. The responses are summarised in Table 5.11.

Table 5.11 Headteachers' perceptions of the importance of practice for trainee teachers against their own route into teaching

Practice	BEd Trained (Inter. 1,3,7,8,9,10,12)	PGCE Trained (Inter. 2,5,6,11)	GTP Trained (Inter. 4)
Learning on the job	1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12	2, 5, 6, 11	4
Seeing what teaching looks like	1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12	2, 5, 6, 11	4
Being training by practitioners	1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12	2, 5, 6, 11	4
Engaging in professional dialogue	1, 3, 7, 9, 10	2, 5, 6	4
Seeing staff as role models	3, 7, 9	2, 6	4

All the respondents identified the practice required by trainee teachers as learning on the job – they needed to practise doing the job of teaching and this practice needed to take place in schools. Respondent eight believed trainees ‘...could only really learn on the job’ with respondent seven suggesting ‘...they learn ten times more in the classroom than in lectures’. This was echoed by respondent five who believed ‘...in school on the job learning is the best because becoming good at anything is all about practice and honing your skills’ and respondent two who identified on the job training as getting ‘...the nuts and bolts to experience it yourself’. Respondent nine suggested ‘...learning on the job is right for teaching’. The headteacher in interview six described this as training where trainees ‘...live and breathe the job’. Respondent twelve believed trainees ‘...really need to be part

of the school right the way through their journey, they need to be close to outstanding teachers’.

Training on the job was linked by the respondents to the idea of authenticity – of trainees seeing what teaching actually looked like. This was described as ‘...the realities of the classroom’ (respondent four), ‘...what it’s really like’ (respondent five) and ‘...teaching and all the other stuff’ (respondent eight). In eight of the interviews respondents used either ‘really’ or ‘realities’ in their descriptions of what practice allows trainees to do, such as, “...what it really feels and looks like’ (respondent one), ‘...what the teacher really does’ (respondent three), ‘...the realities of the classroom’ (respondent four), ‘...what it’s really like in schools’ (respondent five) and ‘...the day to day realities’ (respondent ten). Respondent four suggested this authenticity was about ‘...the quantity and quality of what the job actually entails’.

All of the respondents suggested that part of the process of gaining understanding of being a teacher is through being trained by people who are at that time doing the job of the teacher – ‘...being trained effectively by the people doing the job day in and day out’ (respondent six) and ‘...the people at the chalk face, the practitioners’ (respondent twelve). Training with these practitioners would allow trainees ‘...to learn from the best’ (respondent five) and respondent eleven believed ‘...working with an outstanding practitioner does wonders for a trainee’. Respondent one suggested these were practitioners who could ‘...support trainees in learning how to teach’ and respondent four that these were practitioners ‘...with a lot of knowledge to pass on’.

This knowledge was part of the professional dialogue they would have with trainees with respondent two suggesting trainees were supported through ‘...constant dialogue about learning’ and respondent nine believing trainees were supported through ‘...unpicking practice with outstanding practitioners’. Respondents one, three, four, six, nine and ten used the term ‘unpick’ to describe elements of the type of dialogue they believed supported trainees. This was largely about a process to enable the trainees to understand why what they had observed was considered best practice – ‘...being able to unpick the outstanding lessons they have observed’ (respondent four), ‘...high quality dialogue so they can unpick it, so they understand how it’s done’ (respondent six) and ‘...unpick all the bits’ (respondent ten).

The best practice was to be seen by the trainees in their observations of staff who were promoted as role models for trainees, what respondent two identified as ‘...showing them how it’s done’. Respondent three suggested this allowed trainees ‘...to see models so they know what they are aspiring to’ and respondent four believed trainees ‘...could learn from watching teachers, they need really well modelled lessons’. Respondents seven and nine noted the importance of trainees being able to observe teachers capable of providing such models.

Theory

In considering the role of theory in the training of teachers the respondents made fewer comments than on practice, not perhaps unsurprising given the fact that all of them identified practice as the aspect of training undertaken in school, which is where they are. In considering what they believed theory to be for trainee teachers the respondents identified theory as being academic, as pedagogy, and as the

process of reflection through time away from the school. This is presented in Table 5.12.

Table 5.12 Headteachers' perceptions of theory for trainee teachers against their own route into teaching

Theory	BEd Trained (Inter. 1,3,7,8,9,10,12)	PGCE Trained (Inter. 2,5,6,11)	GTP Trained (Inter. 4)
Academic/theoretical	1, 7, 8, 9	2, 5, 6, 11	4
Pedagogy	3, 9, 10, 12	2, 11	4
Reflection through time away from school	1, 7, 8	5	

Respondent two referred to theory as '...a whole other level of training' but neither she nor most of the other respondents appeared to explain this in detail.

Respondents four, five and eight referred to it as the academic side of training.

Respondents one, two, five and six described it as theoretical training. Respondents seven and ten identified it as '...background', with respondent seven suggesting that included '...facts'. Respondents seven, nine and eleven believed it was required to give student time to read and research. Respondent nine perhaps summed their views up when she noted '...theory is the academic side of training: reading; research; and educational theories'. Respondents linked educational theories to the study of pedagogy and believed this was need to back up the practice experienced in schools, what respondent three suggested as '...explaining what good practice looks like' and respondent eleven as '...researching the pedagogy of why we're doing things as we are'. This pedagogy should be about '...how children learn' (respondent one), '...the theory behind learning' (respondent two), '...professional

knowledge (respondent eight) and ‘...strong subject knowledge’ (respondent twelve). There were no discernible differences in views amongst the headteachers in terms of their own routes into teaching or their years of experience.

Trainee teachers needed opportunities to step away from the school in order to reflect on their training. Respondent five believed they needed ‘...time to step back and reflect on their experiences, sit with other students and talk with those outside the school’. Respondent seven suggested they needed ‘...to compare their experiences’, respondent eight that they should ‘...go and talk about their practice’ and respondent seven that this provides trainees with ‘...moral support and the opportunity to share experiences’. The headteachers making these responses were experienced in teacher training having between twelve and thirty years of experience. It may be that this length of experience, which is likely to have seen them work working with a number of trainee teachers, has contributed to their perceptions that trainee teachers benefit from time outside of the school during their training.

One respondent believed it was important for trainees to experience theory away from schools because ‘...academics, you know, often put an alternative view to the government point of view’ (respondent five). Another believed professionals outside of the school might ‘...throw something in to the pot, you go away and think about it and it might shift your thinking’ (respondent eleven). Both of these headteachers qualified by means of the PCGE route and their views may reflect their own experiences in training, although it should also be noted that they had considerable length of teacher training experience, fourteen and twenty-one years,

and this may have also contributed to perceptions of the value of theoretical study undertaken outside of the school in teacher training.

Time

The headteachers valued trainees being given time to undertake practice, their time on the job, and away from the school to study theory. This was largely evident in their comments about what they perceived to be the shortcomings of the PGCE route in terms of lack of time during the training year for trainees to develop their theoretical understanding and practical skills, with respondent eight believing '...they still haven't had quite enough time to pick up on all that being a teacher is' and '...there's too much theory thrown at them and they don't get time to consider' (respondent one). Respondent nine suggested this impacted on them in their NQT year as '...they didn't get the time to be able to hit the ground running'.

Commitment

In a link back to the respondents' views on good teachers and potential in aspiring teachers, the ability of trainees to commit to teaching whilst training was perceived to be an important aspect of successful training. Respondent five exemplified this by noting she looked for trainees who '...really know they want to do it' and respondent ten that '...they're committed to the profession'. Respondents seven and nine expressed their concerns about working with trainees who were either too young to commit teaching or those who may simply be adding another qualification to their CV without a commitment to teaching.

Location of responsibility for practice and theory

The respondents believed trainee teachers needed to study theory and practice during their training and this largely came down to their views that the practical training was the aspect best done in schools with the experts there and that there were elements of theoretical training which were best done outside of schools and for which the schools had little responsibility. Partners were therefore required, according to the headteachers, for three main reasons: because it was not the schools' remit to lead on teacher training; because partners were the experts in theoretical training; and because schools' participation in teacher training needed monitoring and validating. Respondent seven exemplified this is noting:

‘I think certain parts of the theory are good to be done at uni or the training centre. I think the theory part that comes in school is through the training that they get here, the inset, the staff meetings. It's a different kind of theory, I think it's the on the job kind rather than maybe the psychology of children and all that. I think that's good to be coming from the uni, from the trained lecturers doing that and I think in school it is the school based training.’

It was universities and SCITTs to which the respondents referred when identifying the providers they believed should be responsible for the theoretical training of trainee teachers. The respondents referred to these providers as their partners in teacher training. However the respondents' identification of partnership was not dissimilar to their identification of theory. They did not given expanded responses but appeared to relate that working with a body outside of their school would be described as a partnership and this would be a partnership of equals. Respondent two described it a ‘...close’, respondent eight as ‘...sharing’, respondent nine as ‘...balanced’ and respondent ten as a partnership ‘...in every sense of the word’. However the partnership working described here seemed to be based on the

premise that schools were the experts in the practical aspects of teaching and the partner as the expert in theory. These partners worked largely separately on teacher training with the school leading the practice-based training and trainees going out of school to ‘...get the theory side’ (respondent two). Respondent five noted:

‘I don’t see my job as headteacher is essentially to train student teachers, that’s not in my job description, you know and whilst it’s something we’re more than happy to support and facilitate and we feel it’s a very true partnership – we gain a lot from it and they gain a lot from it but I don’t think it should be solely our role to make those decisions.’

These concerns were expressed by other headteachers concerned about the level to which schools could lead on teacher training. Like respondent five, respondents two, seven, eight and ten questioned their responsibilities in teacher training – ‘...schools can’t do it all’ (respondent two), ‘...I don’t’ see it as my role, my role is to teach children and employ good teachers’ (respondent seven), ‘...I’m not qualified and it’s not part of my remit’ (respondent eight) and ‘...we’re too busy, we don’t have the manpower or the resources’ (respondent ten). The headteachers were seeking partnerships with those they perceived to be the experts in theory.

Respondent three believed these were those for whom theory was ‘...their business’, respondent two noted they should have ‘...the latest up to date theory and the experience of teacher training, which we haven’t got’ and respondent four believed they would provide ‘...a high quality academic side’. Four of the five respondents who expressed these views were in the group of respondents with the least number of years of headship experience (respondents two, seven, eight and

ten) and this could suggest that they viewed increased responsibility for teacher training as something for which they felt unprepared.

The headteachers considered the need for external monitoring of the teacher training taking place in their schools and this would be undertaken by their partners. Respondent one articulated this role as one where the partner would discuss, support, make suggestions and challenge the work of the school.

Respondent eight wanted a partner which accredited schools undertaking teacher training in an '...umbrella process', with respondent seven suggesting this was required for '...standardisation' and respondent six to provide '...a national overview around quality of training'. Respondent eleven believed there was a need for an outside body to monitor '...consistency' amongst schools and respondents six and twelve used the term '...quality assurance' to describe this process. Respondent four noted that he believed teacher training '...needs to be properly policed and monitored so the quality is maintained'. Respondents two, five seven and eight expressed their wish for an external view to support them in their judgements of trainees with one noting '...external moderation is essential, I wouldn't feel happy to make judgements without that extra opinion' (respondent five). Of the eight respondents who sought external support for moderation five of them were in the group of headteachers with the least headship experience, although they had between ten and twenty years of teacher training experience, which may suggest they welcomed the opportunity to work with others when making judgements as headteachers. However three other more experienced headteachers also sought to have external moderation provision so no clear conclusion can be drawn. Neither of

the two most experienced respondents (respondents three and twelve) in terms of headship mentioned the use of external moderation but both of these headteachers had delegated responsibility for teacher training in their schools to middle leaders. This is discussed later in this chapter.

Preferred Routes into Primary Teacher Training

Having considered their views on how best to train primary teachers the respondents identified the route or routes into teaching they believed best supported primary school trainee teachers. This is presented in Table 5.13.

Table 5.13 Headteachers choice(s) of route(s) into primary teaching against their own route into teaching

Preferred Route	BEd Trained (Inter. 1,3,7,8,9,10,12)	PGCE Trained (Inter. 2,5,6,11)	GTP Trained (Inter. 4)
BEd	3, 7, 9, 12	2, 11	
PGCE	3, 7, 9, 12	2, 5, 11	
SDS	1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12	2, 6, 11	4
Teaching School	3, 12		

The single most popular route was the SDS. This route scored well in terms of the practical experience the headteachers valued but not for other aspects they valued such as theoretical study and commitment to teaching. But it was the only route in which the respondents felt they had a level of control over, and influence on, the training. Respondent four explained he believed he had ‘...quite a lot of choice over the trainee on that route, as a headteacher’. Respondent one described a trainee on the SDS route as ‘...an apprentice’ and respondents six and eight preferred the route because the trainees were mostly in the school. Respondent one felt this meant she felt ‘...more responsible for their training’ and respondent ten noted:

‘I feel so much more satisfaction at the end of their training, knowing you’ve been influential. And that’s really pleasurable actually, though it’s a bit of a selfish reason.’

This is not to say that the SDS route completely dominated the headteachers’ preferences as six of them were keen to see more than one route into teaching.

Two respondents commented that potential teachers came from different backgrounds and circumstances and suited different routes (respondents seven and eleven). Respondent three said:

‘I would celebrate the fact that there are different routes into teaching, the more routes we have into teaching the more (trainees) we can attract and the more variety we can have.’

Respondent twelve echoed this by saying he was looking ‘...for a range of people’ to enter teaching and that there should be routes ‘...for eighteen year olds and for career changers, just as long as they were there for the right reasons’. Respondent nine declared she preferred to see the BEd and the SDS routes because ‘...the BEds really have to study child development and that makes a difference and the SDS ones come up through the ranks and so they have the practical intelligence’.

Despite the BEd route scoring well in the key factors of practice, theory, time and commitment no respondent selected it as their single preferred route. The only respondent to select only the PCGE route, respondent five, was herself trained through this route and she acknowledged this in her interview saying:

‘It is partly because that’s the route I went into teaching.....but also because the students have spent three years following an academic course’.

The government’s flagship policy of teaching schools and their potential role to take the lead in teacher training received largely negative responses from the headteachers and one possible reason for this was suggested by respondent twelve

who is the head of a teaching school. Although he firmly believed in the concept of teaching schools allowing schools to work together in a self-improving system to include participation in ITT, he felt that teaching schools were currently being perceived by headteachers in other schools as ‘...exclusive clubs’ where joining the club meant doing what the lead school told you to do. This was something he disputed, but he perceived the reason for this to be in the manner the government was portraying teaching schools - as ‘...an elite group’. There was some evidence of this in the comments of other headteachers as only one suggested he would be prepared to work with a teaching school (respondent three). He was amongst the most experienced headteachers and was looking for a variety of routes into teaching because he noted a decline in the numbers of applicants for teaching posts and believed a recruitment crisis was imminent, so his decision may be a pragmatic one. The five other respondents who mentioned teaching schools made negative comments, with respondent one believing ‘...we don’t need lead schools’, respondent four that ‘...they want the best teachers for themselves’, respondent six believing they had ‘...not been well thought through’ and respondent eleven suggesting teaching schools ‘...were only as good as the day they were judged outstanding and I’m not sure I’d have trust in them’. Respondent five summed up some of these views in saying:

‘I went to that outstanding schools conference a while ago and Charlie Taylor spoke at that and so did Michael Gove and the whole thrust of the day, which wasn’t made clear in the information we were sent prior to the conference, was all about teaching schools and all about this push to make outstanding schools teaching schools. I don’t agree with it and I don’t see what their agenda is. There must be some big agenda to bypass the universities. Exactly to save money I would imagine and also academics, you know, often put an alternative view to the government point of view’.

Reflection

I think that like the respondents when I was in schools I favoured practice over theory but believed my practice to be underpinned by theory. Since working in HE and teacher education I believe I have developed a more explicit and obvious appreciation and use of theory. It is a challenge to find the balance between theory and practice for trainee teachers and I understand the thinking of the respondents who suggested that more than one route into teaching allows for differentiation in training to suit a variety of entrants – the idea that there is no one route to teaching. However I find it interesting that the SDS was the single most popular route and that this appears to be partly due to the level of influence the headteachers perceive the school has over the training the trainee receives. I think this may, in turn, link to the concept of growing one's own teachers. My concern with this is that it could result in trainees gaining a narrow view of what good practice might be, narrowed perhaps to one school. This has made me look more closely at the balance of training and the influence of the school on the SDS trainees who I support as their tutor. I have become more conscious of engaging them in discussions which prompt critical reflection on practices in school.

'If you've said they can learn how to do their job at your school, then you have to give them the opportunity to succeed and make sure this happens.'

The final theme gained its title from the comment by respondent one who noted what she felt was her responsibility to the trainee teachers she allowed to train in her school. This summed up many of the comments made by the other headteachers. They believed that trainee teachers needed to be mostly trained in

schools – on the job – and that this was their domain and they, as headteachers, held the strategic responsibility for creating the opportunity for trainees to succeed. The role of the school was to expose trainees to the practice in the schools, allow them to practise it, discuss it and refine their own practice. The respondents identified factors which they believed disposed a school to be able to offer the practice environment the headteachers believed was essential for the trainee teachers to succeed. These factors comprised: the Ofsted grade the school held; the climate or ethos of the school; the leadership of the headteacher; teachers who were able to mentor trainees; and other staff with expert knowledge. In addition the respondents mentioned factors beyond their own school which they perceived to impact negatively on their ability or willingness to participate in teacher training. These factors were: government pressures on schools, to include the role of Ofsted; government pressures to require schools to take on more responsibility for teacher training; and perceptions of teaching as a career in this country. These factors for success are presented in this section, followed by the factors which impact negatively and concluding with a personal reflection.

The factors the headteachers perceived to be required to ensure trainee teachers are given the opportunity to succeed are presented in Table 5.14.

Table 5.14 Headteachers' perceptions of factors in school required to give trainee teachers the opportunity to succeed against their own route into teaching

Factors	BEd Trained (Inter. 1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12)	PGCE Trained (Inter. 2, 5, 6, 11)	GTP Trained (Inter. 4)
Ofsted grade of good or outstanding	1, 7, 8, 10	2, 5, 6	4
Willingness/responsibility	1, 3, 8, 9, 10, 12	5, 6	4

to participate in ITT			
Opportunity to grow your own teachers	3, 10, 12	6, 11	
Ethos of the school	1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12	2, 5, 6, 11	4
Headteacher leadership	1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12	2, 5, 6, 11	4
Teachers able to mentor trainees	1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12	2, 5, 6, 11	4
Involvement of other staff	1, 3, 8, 9, 10	2, 6	4

School grading

Of the twelve headteachers who participated in this study ten led schools with Ofsted grades of good and two led schools graded as outstanding by Ofsted.

Although none of the respondents specifically referred to Ofsted as having a role in deciding which schools participated in teacher training it was the respondents' use of what might be referred to as Ofsted language which suggested they were making a link between Ofsted inspections of schools and schools' ability to effectively participate in teacher training. Respondents use the terms 'good schools' and 'good and outstanding schools' to describe where trainee teachers should learn their practice and where they should, according to the respondents, spend the majority of their training time, exemplified by respondent five who noted the training school should be '...at least good if not outstanding'. Respondent eight believed school had to be at least good because:

'If they're not in a very good school with lots of very good practice they are starting off their careers with very poor role models and a poor perception of what teaching can be'.

Similarly respondent two noted that:

‘Trainees need to be in a school that’s solidly good or outstanding to get the absolute best practice because if you’re a struggling school you haven’t got the time to give’.

The other Ofsted term used by the respondents was ‘category’ and this was used to indicate why schools might not participate in teacher training. Respondent six suggested:

‘There’s an issue around now for schools going into a category, even RI [Requires Improvement], that suddenly the pressures are so high on the schools that it could affect a trainee’s experience’.

Similarly, respondent ten believed trainees should not be placed ‘...in schools with other things on their minds, like categories like special measures’. The respondents’ perceptions on schools of the impact of Ofsted inspections is discussed further later in this section.

Willingness and responsibility to participate in teacher training

Respondent nine chose to use government language to identify what she believed was her responsibility to the profession of teaching in noting that

‘We should all have a commitment to train the next generation.’

Two other respondents made comments along these lines with respondents five noting she felt the need ‘...to give something back to the profession I adore’ and respondent ten who suggested headteachers ‘...all have to embrace teacher training’. The other responses were more about headteachers’ willingness, or choice, in participating in teacher training – be ‘willing’ or ‘want to do it’ (respondents one, three, four, six, eight). Respondent eight suggested schools needed ‘...to be willing to give trainees the best possible chance’ and respondent two noted trainees in school need ‘...a strong support package’. Respondent one

summarised this in noting that everyone on the school needed to ‘...work together to support the trainee’.

Grow your own teachers

Six respondents referred to teacher training in schools as allowing them to grow their own teachers. Respondent twelve noted that he ‘believed passionately in teacher training to grow our own teachers’ and this view was echoed by five other respondents. Respondent two said she was willing to participate in teacher training ‘so we can grow our own teachers partly, shaping to how your school works’.

Respondent three noted ‘we’re growing our own teachers’, respondent six described trainees as ‘home grown teachers’, respondent ten noted ‘I like to grow my own’ and respondent eleven said it as a system ‘to grow your own teachers’.

This may link to the headteachers’ views on teachers fitting the school in terms of being like them. There was a tension here, however, as four of the five respondents who used the term ‘grow your own’ also spoke about schools needing to be willing to participate in teacher training (respondents three, six, ten and twelve). This might be viewed as looking inward to their own schools rather than outward to the wider community of the teaching profession. These four respondents had between two and thirty-one years of headship experience and between twelve and twenty-six years teacher training experience, so the idea of ‘grow your own’ appears to appeal to more experienced and less experienced headteachers. One factor which contributed to this may be the pragmatic one of teacher recruitment as three of the five respondents using the term ‘grow your own’ mentioned recruitment.

Respondents one and ten stated that they had experienced a reduction in the

number of applicants for posts at their schools and respondent twelve, the head of the teaching school, noted that part of his school's remit was to support teacher recruitment in the local area.

Ethos or climate

The sense that a school should be open to all learners was the focus of responses linked to the ethos of the school, exemplified by respondent eleven who noted that trainee teachers should be placed in schools '...where the role of the school is the education of everybody in the community'. These schools were identified by their '...openness' (respondents one, seven and nine), '...a welcoming community' (respondent ten) and '...supportive' (respondents five, seven and eight).

Respondent three believed participation in teacher training was part of an ethos which sought to create a '...mixed economy' of benefit to staff, trainees and pupils. Respondent two suggested this encouraged '...constant discussions on learning' and respondent four believed this type of ethos reflected '...a vibrant place where you are pushing forward, pushing for excellence'.

Headteacher leadership

The need for leadership of teacher training in a school was cited by all twelve headteachers who identified their role in strategically leading, managing and monitoring the process. Six headteachers referred to the need for their strategic leadership to create a climate, or ethos, where successful training could take place (respondents one, three, nine, ten, eleven and twelve). Respondent one exemplified this saying she believed as she made the decision for training take place in her school it was her responsibility '...to give the trainee the opportunity to

succeed'. Another respondent believed this type of strategic leadership required '...high quality headteachers who are really switched on to the process' (respondent four). Respondent two suggested this process involved '...all the seeing, the liaising, making sure they're on track, picking up problems', with respondent five echoing this by believing her role was that of '...a watching overview, to step in if needed'. Leadership by the head was crucial to success according to respondent eleven who believed '...the head leads in terms of philosophy and commitment' and respondent twelve who noted '...the head is vital in leading the teacher training in the school'. Respondent three agreed with this view but suggested it might limit the sustainability of teacher training in schools in noting:

'Participation in teacher training comes from the head. I've always been keen to be involved but the minute I go from here some other person might come in and won't want it. That will impinge on the roles other have in the school but they are going to have to live with it.'

With the exception of three of the respondents the majority perceived it was their direct role to lead teacher training in their school. Respondent three noted that he had made the strategic leadership of teacher training part of the job description for one of the school's assistant headteacher posts, respondent eight had delegated the leadership to the deputy headteacher and respondent twelve had '...distributed the leadership to middle leaders', although it should be noted that all three respondents said that they would be involved in supporting staff and trainees.

Respondent ten was the only one to use the term professional mentor and suggest that a trainee in school needed one, alongside a teaching mentor, who would give '...the bigger picture, more whole school perspective or education perspective in general'. She noted that she felt this was her role as headteacher because:

‘It needs to be someone with the capacity and time to give it [the role] justice. I feel I’m that person, I kind of embody that.

If teacher training was taking part in their school the respondents believed the process would require formal monitoring by them, perhaps a reflection of the level of the formal monitoring of performance expected of schools and judged as part of Ofsted inspections. Nine of the headteachers explicitly identified one of their roles to be that of monitoring teacher training in the school, with respondent four exemplifying their concerns that it was important to undertake ‘...quality checks’. Respondent seven suggested this included ‘...overseeing it and making sure the trainee and the mentor are getting what they are entitled to and doing what they should be doing’. Any concerns led, believed respondent eight, to the headteacher ‘...getting involved when things go wrong’.

School Mentors

The members of staff, other than the headteachers themselves, who were mentioned most frequently, were school-based mentors for trainees. This was the person on the ground who would lead the trainee’s training in school. The respondents felt it was their role to identify mentors and they did this by looking at the mentor’s own practice, their ability to discuss good practice and their ability to mentor and coach adult learners.

Eight respondents believed the mentor should be an outstanding practitioner in order that they ‘...know what outstanding looks like’ (respondent one). Mentors were described as ‘...your absolute best person’ (respondent two), ‘...someone who is obviously outstanding’ (respondent seven) and ‘...they’re skilled at their job, they’re an outstanding practitioner’ (respondent nine). The mentor needed to be

able to discuss good practice with trainees, with respondent five identifying that mentors needed to be '...confident enough to talk about teaching in an instructional way'. Respondents three and nine both used the term 'unpicking' to describe the type of professional dialogue the mentor needed to be able to lead and respondents five, seven and eight noted that these discussions would also give mentors the chance to reflect on their own practice. The mentors need to have the skills to work with adults summarised by respondent nine who believed:

'Mentors need to be able to scaffold adults' learning, so they need to be a mentor, a facilitator and a coach, and a challenger, and be able to pose those challenging questions.'

It is possible this exposes tensions in the concept of the novice learning from the expert in terms of the power being with the expert (here the mentor) and how they chose to present the learning. This was perhaps partially addressed by some of the headteachers who specified a coaching approach being adopted by the mentors. Respondent four believed teacher training mentors should '...start as mentors to put the skills in place that they [the trainees] need to be successful and when they've got these move to a coaching role', respondent six having a similar approach whereby mentors '...start with mentoring in a direct approach but then back off and ask them [trainees] questions to find out for themselves' and respondent eleven noting that her experiences of increased time spent in school by trainees necessitated the school support including '...what would be called coaching now'. The ability to provide feedback was highlighted as a key skill of a mentor by the eight headteachers to include '...even when the message is not easy' (respondent eight).

Role of other staff

The mentor was the main person the trainee would work with but there was some identification of the need for trainees to work with school staff beyond the appointed mentor. The suggestion was that mentors, although carefully chosen, would not have a wide enough range of expertise to meet all the in-school training needs of trainee teachers. The trainees needed opportunities to work with other staff and the staff needed to be willing and able to do this through their own understanding of their role in teacher training in the school. Respondent one believed trainees needed to work with ‘...other people in the team who are outstanding and who know what outstanding looks like’ and respondent three suggested this would include ‘...a variety of staff engaged in lesson observations and feedback’. Respondent eight acknowledged the benefits of this to the school ‘...it’s good for my staff to be involved in this’ and respondent eleven believed ‘...the whole staff need to feel ownership of it, they need to feel part of the training community’. Similarly, respondent twelve suggested that:

‘Everyone in the school environment plays a part in developing the full, rounded person that you want to develop to become an outstanding practitioner, or at least good.’

One Headteacher said trainees needed to be able to work with a range of teachers to ‘...share their expertise (respondent seven) and respondent eight noted that in order for this to happen staff in the school needed to be ‘...sympathetic to and knowledgeable about the training programme’.

Factors which impact negatively on schools’ ability to participate in teacher training
In their reflections on teacher training the headteachers demonstrated a keenness to maintain control over their schools and discussed that they believed it was their

decision whether they should participate in teacher training. All the respondents had taken the decision that their school would participate in training but in the course of the interviews some of them identified factors they believed could impact on this decision. These were factors the respondents perceived were beyond their control: government policies and procedures including the monitoring of school by Ofsted; the recent policy in moving greater responsibility to schools for teacher training; and how the teaching profession was perceived outside of schools. The responses are summarised in Table 5.15.

Table 5.15 Headteachers' perceptions of factors which impact negatively on schools' participation in ITT against their own route into teaching

Factors	BEd Trained (Inter. 1, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12)	PGCE Trained (Inter. 2, 5, 6, 11)	GTP Trained (Inter. 4)
External pressures and Ofsted	1, 3, 7, 10, 12	5, 6, 11	4
Not our responsibility	3, 7, 8, 9, 10	2, 5, 6	4
Perceptions of teaching	3, 7, 8, 9	5	

External pressure on schools

Eight respondents made reference to government pressures impacting on the capacity of schools to participate in successful teacher training, described by respondent three as '...the demands that are put upon schools by people and organisations external to it', adding that '...external monitoring of the Headteacher then feeds down to the teachers and has a danger of making the job not seem so attractive'. Respondent seven believed the opinions of those in school were not respected because policy makers '...make assumptions or they look back on their

own experiences of schools but they don't talk to the people in the frontline'.

Respondent four noted that schools had become '...hard and driven places' due to being '...results based, highly target driven'. The pressure of Ofsted inspections were specifically commented on by seven of the Headteachers. Referring to current government directives, respondent three suggested:

'We're Ofsted scared, too busy to train the next generation, more worried about keeping the ones you've got afloat as it is and not just afloat because being afloat isn't good enough.'

Headteacher four believed schools were dissuaded from participating in teacher training due to:

'The aggressive nature of Ofsted and the way they sell themselves and picture themselves, they're nothing short of bullies as far as I am concerned.'

This, he noted, restricted his ability to regularly take on trainee teachers because '...if we're in an Ofsted year I've got to protect what I've got and make sure I give them my full attention' and this view was supported by respondent three who noted that, in his experience, this did occur and that '...some schools seem to have decided to concentrate on their own staff in terms of Ofsted inspections'.

Respondent eleven believed the only thing Ofsted was interested in was results, '...all we are judged on now is English and maths results' but that in her school '...we're about education and sending out our children with the skills to do well at high school and in life'. Respondent one suggested Ofsted are only interested in her school '...once every thousand days and I deal with that' and respondent ten described it as '...the Ofsted game we play'. Respondent twelve, the most experienced in terms of headship and the leader of the teaching school, said that

although his teaching school could support other schools to improve it could not
‘...take away those external pressures that cause a fear within them’ and he
believed there needed to be a change of policy ‘...from the top down’.

Schools taking on more responsibility for teacher training

The premise of schools taking on more responsibility for teacher training concerned eight of the respondents who questioned schools’ capacity to do this, with some of the respondents noting that it should not solely be their responsibility. Of these, four suggested they did not have the time to do this. Comments from respondents included ‘...because we haven’t got the time to sit here and do that’ (respondent three), ‘...heads and management don’t have the time’ (respondent seven), ‘...we’re too busy’ (respondent eight) and ‘...we’re focused on the today and the tomorrow and work at such a pace we don’t give the background’ (respondent ten). The ability for schools to do it all I questioned by five respondents with respondent two saying:

‘I wouldn’t want it to see it come over entirely to schools because I don’t think you can do the whole thing.’

Similarly respondent seven felt:

‘We’re not trained to train teachers, I don’t feel qualified nor have the time to train teachers and I don’t think it’s our remit anyway.’

Respondent six echoed this by noting ‘...this is not within the schools’ remit’ and respondent five noted this was ‘...not in my job description’. Headteacher nine believed:

‘I wouldn’t be able to give student teachers the depth of academic attainment and reading, and searching, and picking up their subject area, and the educational theories.’

Concerns were expressed by five respondents in terms of the finances for teacher training with respondent eight noting the school ‘...did not have the finances or the manpower or resources to do it’ and respondent nine suggesting ‘...in a small school like mine I wouldn’t be able to afford it’. Respondent two suggested the government was looking to ‘...train teachers on the cheap’ and headteacher five noted of the government that ‘...they are trying to save money I would think’. Respondent five suggested ‘...if there was a big stream of funding it’s a possibility but that’s not there’ and respondent six noted:

‘If you’re expecting me to train someone you’re going to have to give me the cash because budgets are getting tighter and tighter,’

Perceptions of teaching as a career

Five respondents made mention of their view that teaching as a career had become less attractive. Respondent three, who is one of the most experienced headteachers, noted that teaching should ‘...be one of the best jobs the country has to offer but people have been dissuaded from entering the profession’. Two headteachers put this down to teaching being undervalued in society (respondents five and seven), with respondent seven noting:

‘I think for a little while have been sort of a bit downtrodden, a bit viewed poorly in the press and I think the status needs to rise.’

Respondent eight believed ‘...the media paint teaching as an easy option and some people come into teaching thinking I might do it for a bit’. The issue of attracting suitable trainees concerned respondents who perceived that reforms to teaching had led some to believe that teaching was an easy career, with respondent seven suggesting ‘...it gives an image to parents and the public that anybody can do it’, respondent three believing ‘...the notion that anybody can walk into a classroom

and teach has some bearing on how the government feels about things' and respondent nine who believed '...the government has a notion that it is all so easy'. Respondent five noted the rising percentage of teachers leaving the profession and believed the reasons why need to be unpicked '...not only on the part of the country but individual people investing so much money to do training and then the job proves impossible for them to do'. Respondent three believed prospective teachers were put off by the belief that teachers were '...constantly being scrutinised and monitored in what they are doing'. The respondents who commented on the perceptions of teaching as a career had between twelve and twenty six years of teacher training experience and between two and twenty six years of headship experience so these views seem to stretch across a range of length of time in post and professional experiences.

Reflection

The headteachers are confident to talk about what they perceive needs to be in place in schools to support teacher training and much of this is centred on their role in creating the climate for this and in identifying the key participants. This reflects back, I think, to their views on identifying the right person to train in their school – the person who they perceive fits their school. It is their school – the school which belongs to that headteacher - which is leading their thinking. My concern with this is the impact of this in terms of increased teacher training responsibilities delegated to schools and this raises two issues for me:

- Are the headteachers seeking to grow their own teachers in such a way as to create teachers who can teach in some schools but not others – is this situated learning and might this resist transferability?

- Is the national policy to train teachers fit to practise or to allow some schools, an elite group, to train teachers for their own schools without a commitment to the wider profession?

The headteachers' views on Ofsted are interesting – they seem to accept Ofsted grades as confirming the performances of their schools and of other schools but they perceive Ofsted as a negative force on schools. The acceptance of Ofsted grades may be a pragmatic stance – this is something beyond their control and thus they perceive their efforts to be better put into the aspects of running their school which are under their control.

Responses from the most experienced headteachers

Three of the headteachers had been participating in teacher training in schools for over twenty-five years, respondents one, three and nine. All were trained through the BEd route. Respondent one had thirty years of teacher training experience and fifteen years of headship so she had the same amount of time spent in supporting teacher training in schools before being a headteacher as she had as a headteacher. Respondent three had twenty-six years' experience of both teacher training and of headship, thus all his teacher training experience was as a headteacher.

Respondent nine had thirty years of teacher training experience and had been a headteacher for eight years, so she had significantly more experience in supporting teacher training than of headship. All three respondents led schools graded good by Ofsted. The breadth of experience of teacher training these three headteachers had could be described as generational – they were participating in training before any qualified teachers under the age of twenty six were born. It also means their experience predates some of the key centralised policies such as the introduction of

the National Curriculum and the creation of Ofsted and it covers the increased move to teacher training in schools. This experience makes them worthy of particular consideration to explore whether there are any links between length of experience of teacher training and views expressed in the interviews and to explore any similarities or differences amongst the three headteachers' responses. This is presented in a similar manner to the previous findings beginning with the headteachers' views on the attributes of good teachers, the use of the Standards and the Ofsted criteria and what they are looking for in prospective teachers. The respondents' views on current and preferred routes into teaching will then be discussed and this will be followed by their comments on the role of schools in supporting teacher training. This section will conclude with a personal reflection.

Teachers fit to practise

Although the three respondents, in line with all the headteachers, gave a range of descriptors to identify the teachers they believed were fit to practise, there were differences in emphasis amongst them (Table 4.4). Respondent one had most descriptors in the critical thinking and the being receptive categories. Respondent three's descriptions were most linked to the being persuasive category, whilst respondent nine linked most closely to the categories of being orderly and industrious. Overall the four most important attributes to these experienced headteachers were: critical thinking; commitment; being industrious; and being persuasive. This suggest a holistic view of the good teacher – one who is able to think for them self, who wants to do the job, who works hard and who can engage others.

In comparing the descriptions of these teachers given by the three headteachers to the Standards (Table 5.6) there were twelve direct matches but the headteachers gave a further twenty eight descriptors which did not appear in the Standards. It was a similar pattern when comparing the headteachers' descriptors to the Ofsted grading criteria (Table 5.7) where there were ten direct matches and the headteachers gave a further twenty seven descriptions which did not appear in the criteria. This may go some way to explain comment made by two of the respondents about the value of the Standards with respondent one suggesting '...we're beyond those here' and respondent three perceiving them to be '...a bit bland'. Respondent nine, however, believed the standards outlined expectations for those entering the profession. An explanation of the lack of links between the respondents and the Ofsted criteria is less easy to explain as all three respondents said they used the Ofsted criteria when observing trainee teachers, with respondent one noting '...my criteria are the same as Ofsted'. In addition the headteachers believed that the trainee teachers should be judged against the same criteria as qualified teachers and they all welcomed the move by Ofsted away from separate sets of judging criteria. One possible explanation may be found in the fact that all three respondents referred to the need for the Standards and the Ofsted criteria to be '...unpicked' for trainees and they noted that this was something they felt school staff had to do to '...show them what it looks like' (respondent nine). This may be what the headteachers did in their descriptions – they went further than the Standards, a set of competences, and the Ofsted criteria, technical judgements on teaching, because they were able to unpick what these looked like in practice –

they made them real and these three headteachers, with their long experience of teacher training, perceived trainee teachers needed practitioners to do this for trainees. In addition these experienced headteachers perceived that there were attributes beyond that which could be ticked as competences or observed in judgements of technical skills in teaching in their identification of critical thinking, commitment, industriousness and persuasiveness.

In considering what they looked for in prospective teachers all three respondents noted someone who wanted to teach, echoing the criteria of commitment.

However respondent one said she was also looking for ‘...someone who will fit, the right person’ and respondent three said he was looking for ‘...the right person’.

Respondent one suggested that she would know the right person when she met them but admitted that she found it difficult to put what being the right person meant into words. Given the variations in their identifications of the attributes of good teachers, and their assessments of the value of the standards, this suggests these two headteachers may be relying on their own belief systems.

Teacher training

All three respondents trained through the BEd route and could see advantages to this route and to the SDS route but not to the PGCE route. The BEd route was praised by the respondents in terms of the time students had to develop their understanding of teaching through ‘...lots of theory, lots of practice’ (respondent one). This contrasted with their views of the PGCE which they all felt was too short a time for trainee teachers to cover the theory and the practice they needed ‘...too much thrown at them’ (respondent one). The SDS was seen as a good route by the

respondents with all three highlighting the length of time spent in school during the training year and with respondents one and three noting that they felt more responsibility towards the trainee because they were employing them in the school. However it was important to all three respondents that trainee teachers had opportunities to study and train outside of the school. Respondent one outlined this as being time when trainees had the opportunity to step away from their practice, to observe practice in other schools and to reflect on what these experiences meant to their own practice. Respondent three and nine also wanted trainees to have the time to reflect on their practice away from their school but in addition they were looking for academic and theoretical training. Respondent three believed '...practice needs to be underpinned with theory' and respondent nine that trainees required '...a depth of academic attainment and research' that schools could not offer. It is possible their own routes into teaching have had an influence on their views as their descriptions match the BEd route into teaching.

This may have also been reflected in the fact that all three respondents expressed the wish to work with others in teacher training and believed that primary schools did not have the capacity to take full responsibility for teacher training, something which is a feature of the BEd route. Working with others would be in partnership and the nature of the partnership was important - it needed to be an '...equal partnership' (respondent three), a '...fifty-fifty one' (respondent nine). The headteachers wished their partners to work with them to provide theoretical training (respondents three and nine) and all three respondents believed the school and its partner would have joint responsibility for the monitoring and grading of

trainees. When discussing their preferred route or routes into teaching respondent one selected the SDS route because of the length of time a trainee spent in school which she felt outweighed any disadvantage of lack of theoretical training, although she had praised the BEd, her own route, for the theoretical study it offered student teachers. The other two respondents were keen to see multiple routes into teaching for the same reason – to attract a range of suitable people into teaching. Respondent three was particularly concerned that there should be different routes into teaching because he believed a teacher recruitment crises was looming, noting a decline in the number of applicants for posts in his school, and he referred to a previous time when he had experienced this and the negative impact he perceived it had had on the school and on the pupils. This concern may be reflected in respondent two's endorsement of teaching schools where he said he was '...prepared' to work with them as well as the providers he was used to working with, universities and SCITTs. All three respondents mentioned teaching schools but only respondent two suggested he would work with them. Respondent one said she did not want her school to be led by another school and respondent nine believed teaching schools '...don't have the full capacity to deliver the academic side of training that is necessary'. These views were shared by some of the other headteachers suggesting length of teacher training experience was not influential here.

The role of the school in teacher training

The need for the headteacher to create the climate for training to take place in their school was mentioned by the three respondents who all used the word

‘responsible’ to describe their role. It was respondent one whose views gave rise to one of the themes when she noted:

‘If you’ve said they can learn how to do their job at your school, then you have to give them the opportunity to succeed and make sure this happens.’

Respondents three and nine noted they would have an ‘...overview’ of the training and both said they would ‘...monitor’ progress. Interestingly respondent three, whose years of teacher training experience were the same as his years of headship experience, had delegated day-to-day responsibility for teacher training in his school to a middle leader, although he maintained an overview. This suggests a strategic approach, perhaps adopted to allow someone with more experience of teacher training in school that him to take the lead. This respondent went on to note that this was his decision and that when another headteacher took over the school they might chose not to do this. There is an acknowledgement here that schools may change when their headteachers change because the headteacher’s own view will take precedence. This has implications for the consistency and continuity of approach to teacher training in a school in the light of moves for schools to take on more responsibility for training.

There was agreement amongst the three respondents about the need for the school to provide mentors who were skilled in supporting trainee teachers. In addition all three respondents noted that the trainees will need to be supported by other members of the school staff who have expertise in particular areas, what respondent one referred to as ‘...a whole gang of staff’ and respondents three and nine as ‘...the school team’. What was apparent from analysis of these three respondents’ comments was their focus on the role of the discussion of practice in

the training of teachers. They all used the terms 'discuss' and 'unpick' to describe what takes place between qualified teachers and trainee teachers. Respondent nine noted she appointed mentors who '...were able to discuss teaching and learning' with trainees, a view echoed by respondent three who looked for mentors who could '...articulate their practice'. This dialogue was concerned with what respondent three referred to as '...unpicking teaching and learning' and which respondent one believed allowed trainees '...to really see what it looks like'. This appears to be what practice, perhaps more specifically good practice, looks like and the respondents seemed to be suggesting that it is not sufficient for trainees to just observe such practice they needed to have the opportunity to discuss it, to take it apart, with more experienced practitioners in order to develop their understanding and to allow them to apply it to their own practice. This suggests the taking of a theoretical perspective to practice. All three respondents noted that trainees would also have the opportunity to have these discussions with other staff in their areas of expertise. The three respondents noted that time had to be created to allow this to occur and both respondents one and nine mentioned that they ensured this time was given during the school day with practitioners freed from their classroom responsibilities. Respondents three and nine noted that this benefited the practitioners as well as the trainees as it gave qualified teachers opportunities to reflect on their own practice, with respondent three noting this as resulting in '...a mixed economy'. What emerges from here is a sense of the importance to these three headteachers of the need for trainee teachers to be able to engage in professional dialogue with experienced teachers and for such professional dialogue

to be taking place in the school as a whole. It was important to all three of them and they strove to create a climate where it could take place in their schools. This may be a reflection of the length of time they have been involved in teacher training.

Two of the respondents mentioned Ofsted inspections as a pressure on schools.

Respondent one believed Ofsted was only interested in her school '...every thousand days' and that it was her job to deal with that on behalf of her school.

Respondent three was more forthright believing that schools were '...Ofsted scared' and felt the need to concentrate on their existing staff and that this dissuaded some schools from participating in teacher training. Respondent nine appeared to accept Ofsted inspections as she believed it was important for schools, headteachers and teachers '...to get to grips with the fact that we are accountable'. Nonetheless she believed that the government perception of teaching was '...that it is so easy' which suggest some tension in her views. Respondent three was also concerned with perceptions about teaching but he believed people were put off entering teaching because of the level of scrutiny and monitoring by government bodies. These views may have influenced these two respondents as they both expressed their views that schools should not have full responsibility for teacher training, although this may also be influenced by the fact that both of them believed trainee teachers were in need of theoretical training which should be provided outside of the school.

Reflection

In reflecting on the views expressed by the three most experienced respondents in terms of teacher training experience I am struck by similarities and the differences

and whether these are attributable in any way to the range of experiences they, as I, have had in over twenty five years of teacher training involvement. The strongest similarity is in their views on the role of professional dialogue in the training of teachers and how this benefits experienced practitioners as well as trainees. I suspect this is as a result of many years' experience and is supported by the fact that the three respondents all noted that time had to be made to allow this to happen. It was so fundamental to the practice of teaching and learning in their schools that the headteachers were prepared to release their teachers from their main role as class teachers to undertake it. This suggests the headteachers believed, and perhaps had experienced, the benefits of doing this outweighed the disadvantages, including the financial costs associated with releasing teachers over and above their statutory Planning, Preparation and Assessment (PPA) and, as appropriate, Leadership times. This in turn calls into question the financial capacity of primary schools, especially small schools, to provide the level of support to trainee teachers that these experienced headteachers identify as crucial to success.

The identification of the four most important attributes seen in good teachers (critical thinking, commitment, being industrious and being persuasive) was a particular interesting as it appeared to me to be a holistic view of what it is to be a teacher and, in identification and description, went beyond that seen in the Standards and the Ofsted criteria. But there were differences in emphasis on which each respondent chose to focus. It was not that they gave startlingly different descriptions of good teachers but rather that some attributes seemed more important to them than others. When this is considered alongside their views that

in prospective teachers they are looking for the right person it raises, for me, the question of whether their own beliefs take precedence over any selection frameworks they may be required to use in increase involvement in the selection of trainee teachers as greater responsibility is moved to schools under the government changes.

I can draw no conclusions here as to whether having a 'generation' of teacher training experience predisposes headteachers to particular views, although I believe it may have influenced their views on the role of professional dialogue in unpicking and making real, in terms of practice, the Standards and the Ofsted criteria.

However reviewing the three headteachers' interviews has reinforced in my mind the earlier findings in terms of the headteachers' perceptions of what they look for in prospective teachers and how this might impact on a teacher training system centred in schools.

Chapter Six: Discussion

Introduction

This chapter discusses the findings of the research study. The chapter is organised under the four theoretical codes drawn from the data and each of these comprises a number of sub-themes:

‘Beyond the Standards’

- Identification of teachers fit to teach primary age children
- Comparisons of headteachers’ identifications against the Teachers’ Standards (DfE, 2011) and the Ofsted grading criteria (Ofsted, 2009)

‘I know it when I see it’

- Headteachers’ perceptions of their ability to identify teachers fit to teach their primary age children
- Implications for recruitment

‘A journey to get them to where it is you want them to be’

- Headteachers’ perceptions of the current routes into primary teaching
- Practising teaching - the role of practice in teacher training
- Studying teaching - the role of theory in teacher training
- Locations for the practice and study of teaching
- Preferred routes into teaching

‘If you’ve said they can learn how to do their job at your school, then you have to give them the opportunity to succeed and make sure this happens’

- Headteachers’ perceptions of the role of Ofsted grading in participation in teacher training
- Creating a climate to support teacher training in schools – roles, responsibilities and resources
- External pressures on schools which impact on willingness or capacity to participate in teacher training

‘Beyond the Standards’

The participating headteachers were asked to identify the characteristics they believed their best teachers demonstrated in order to establish a context for their views on how trainee teachers could be supported to become teachers fit to teach primary age children. In the interviews the respondents were asked to describe outstanding teachers. As noted in chapter five, the headteachers used, and switched between, the terms *good*, *best* and *outstanding* when responding to the original question and additional probes to explore their perceptions of the teachers they believed were fit to teach primary age children. For clarity in the discussion the term ‘good teachers’ is used to represent the teachers the headteachers’ believed were fit to practise in their primary schools.

Identification of teachers fit to teach primary age children

When asked to identify what it was that good teachers did the headteachers gave descriptions of attributes and actions which covered a wide range. The descriptions were not just focused on the job of the teacher, they also considered predispositions that the headteachers perceived people required in order to become teachers fit to practise and these linked to the ideas, amongst others, expressed by Barr (1958), Kyriakides, Campbell and Christofidou (2002), Darling-Hammond and Brailsford (2005), Beishuizen *et al* (2001) and Kennedy (2006).

There were strong links to Sockett’s (2009:295) ‘...disposition to teach’ where he described this as comprising the attributes of character, intellect and care. These attributes were all present in the headteachers’ identifications. Character could be seen in the headteachers’ perceptions of the ways in which teachers demonstrated

their commitment to teaching, to include being willing to take risks. The identification of the attribute of critical thinking illustrated the intellectual attributes. Care was seen in many of the verbs the headteachers used to describe their best teachers – encouraging, motivating, sharing and supporting. In addition, the descriptions of these attributes given by the headteachers indicated that they, like Sockett (2009), believed that it was not sufficient for teachers to just possess these attributes; they needed to have the ability and judgement to apply them appropriately and independently in a wide range of contexts.

This demands a great deal of teachers and may explain why the identification of critical thinking was the category to which the headteachers' descriptions of the actions of good teachers most contributed. The headteachers believed good teachers were identified by their abilities in critical and analytical thinking; they were able to think independently and from this to be able to take actions appropriate to the context. These were the teachers Hattie (2012) believed had the potential to become expert teachers able to reflect on the impact they had on outcomes for their pupils. This linked to Sockett's (2009) view that this was the key disposition which allowed teachers to make sophisticated judgements. It also linked to one of the five sets of characteristics for effective teachers in the Hay-McBer report (2000) but which was absent from the subsequent sets of Standards created by successive governments to regulate the work of teachers (TDA, 2007: DfE, 2011). This reinforces the view that the Standards represent a set of prescribed technical skills (Ball, 2003: Beck, 2009; Taubman, 2009).

Identifying critical thinking as crucial for good teachers suggested the headteachers perceived that to be a good teacher required a predisposition of intellectual capacity. This created some tension when viewed against the headteachers' perceptions of potential teachers where only four of the twelve headteachers suggested they looked for academic skills or qualifications in applicants. It may be argued that academic skills and qualifications do not necessarily wholly represent critical and analytical thinking but three of the headteachers noted high grades and studying a subject degree indicated potential teachers who were capable of applying themselves academically. However, this was not a view shared by all the headteachers, with others being more sceptical of the value of the qualifications and preferring to look for what they perceived to be practical intelligence. It is possible that this practical intelligence represents Sockett's (2009) notion of being able to apply intellect in making appropriate judgements and Lunenburg and Korthagen's (2009) premise of practical wisdom. Nonetheless, for some of the headteachers there was the tension that they identified intellectual capacity in their descriptions of good teachers but appeared to put less emphasis on this when considering the selection of potential teachers. This may have implications if schools assume greater responsibility for teacher training to include the selection of trainees. This will be discussed further later in this chapter.

A commitment to the job of being a teacher was the second most popular identifier of good teachers according to the headteachers and this linked to the findings of Kyriakides, Campbell and Christofidou (2002), Osguthorpe (2008), Sockett (2009) and Hay-McBer (2000). Kyriacou and Coulthard (2000) identified commitment to

teaching as a key motivation factor for those entering teaching; with this being altruistic in terms of a wish to contribute to society by means of a worthwhile job and intrinsic in terms of working with children and undertaking the role of the teacher. There was a greater synergy between this identification and the headteachers' views on potential teachers as a commitment to teaching was the main indicator which the headteachers looked for in aspiring teachers. Although this again creates a tension in terms of the possibility that the headteachers may be persuaded by applicants who perceived they really wanted to teach but who may lack the intellectual capacity believed to be required by the headteachers to go on to become the teachers they seek to employ in their schools.

This tension seemed also to surface in some of the other categories identified by the headteachers, as they were seen to value the ability to work with others and to be industrious, orderly, persuasive and receptive. The question arises as to whether a potential teacher who appears open, sociable, hard-working and keen to teach but who is less secure in critical and analytical thinking can, through their training, go on to become a good teacher. Several of the headteachers suggested this could happen, linking to Kennedy's (2006) view that training is one of the determiners of teaching quality. This would demand that the training programme contains opportunities for trainees to develop their critical thinking skills. The headteachers' views on teacher training are considered later in this chapter.

Overall the headteachers had a holistic view of good teachers, exemplified by the three most experienced in teacher training who believed that good teachers were predominantly identified by their ability to think critically, their commitment to

their job and by being orderly and persuasive. These were the views of leaders in the front line, as the government chooses to describe them, so it might be expected that their perceptions and those of government on what constitutes the good teacher would be homogenous. A review of the Standards suggested this was not the case.

Comparisons of headteachers' identifications against the Teachers' Standards and the Ofsted criteria

The route to Qualified Teacher Status (QTS) for trainee teachers is through meeting the Teachers' Standards (DfE, 2011b) and thus these can be seen to be used to regulate teachers. These Standards appeared to be less demanding of teachers than the attributes identified by the headteachers. There was, however, a keener match between the views of the headteachers and the review of the literature. This raises a number of issues.

One issue may be that the headteachers, in responding to the question posed to them about how they identified the teachers they believed were fit to teach primary age children, were reflecting on their experiences of the very best teachers they knew. This suggests an acceptance that not all teachers will be good and it may be that the Teachers' Standards (DfE, 2011b) might be viewed as setting the minimum standards for attaining QTS, which some of the headteachers suggested was the case. This links to views expressed by Cochran-Smith (2006), Stevens (2010) and Alexander (2010), and to Euade's (2014:9) suggestion that Standards for teachers '...explore neither the complexity nor contingency of the class teacher's overall role'. The headteachers, in their descriptions, appeared to try to articulate this complexity, particularly in their consideration of teachers being able to

independently make wise judgements in different contexts (Kennedy, 2006; Sockett, 2009; Lunenberg and Korthagen, 2009). The headteachers were aware of the complexity of the class teacher's role but this was not reflected in the Standards, which calls into question whether the Standards are valid measures of fitness to practice.

It may be that the headteachers viewed the Standards as just part of the process of teacher training and that other factors played as important, or perhaps more important, roles in developing teachers fit to practise. The headteachers perceived the Standards to be a series of tick boxes, or audit, to be completed in an administrative process to demonstrate the competence of the trainee (Trotter, Ellison and Davies, 1997). However, the headteachers appeared to be seeking much more than competence in the teachers they wanted to employ in their schools; they were seeking the predisposition to do the job, the competencies (Trotter, Ellison and Davies, 1997). The headteachers were endorsing the views of those such as Cochran-Smith (2006), Ball (2003), Beck (2009) and Taubman (2009) that the Standards represent a narrow vision of the role of the teacher by reducing it to that which can be measured. Gerwirtz (2002:156) suggested the Standards represented the requirement of compliance through external audit and were '...characterised by routinisation and standardisation'. The headteachers in this study were looking for much more than that contained in the Standards, which is something which has the potential to create conflict if schools assume the lead position in the training of teachers.

Nonetheless the headteachers accepted the Standards as a measure of ability to teach in terms of being used to assess fitness for the awarding of Qualified Teacher Status (QTS). This calls into question the consideration of whether QTS equates with fitness to teach. The headteachers in this study suggested this was not the case – they were looking for more from their good teachers. Yet they accepted the use of the Standards as the assessment system for QTS. This may suggest a willingness to comply with government directives despite their personal beliefs. Or perhaps the headteachers viewed the Standards as a form of baseline assessment of teacher ability which they supplemented by their own judgements. If this is the case, there may be issues arising from headteachers using their own judgements in terms of increasing the propensity for situated learning for trainee teachers as more responsibility for teacher training is given to schools. Trainee teachers may need to ensure they evidence the Standards as interpreted by the headteacher, and possibly staff, of their training school and meet any additional expectations set by the school. For some trainees this could result in strengthened training where the school enriches what they see as the minimum requirements set by the Standards to ensure the trainee has the training opportunities to allow them to develop their understanding of the complexities of the class teacher's role. For other trainees they may receive little more than that required to meet the Standards. The end result may be that both sets of trainees are awarded QTS but one set may be much better prepared to succeed in their chosen career and thus variation in teacher quality is set from the outset of qualification. For school-centred teacher training the choice of school to train in may decide a trainee's professional future.

The apparent compliance by headteachers in accepting the Standards was also in evidence in the headteachers' perceptions of the use of the Ofsted criteria where, as with the Standards, the headteachers' indicators of good teachers were far broader than those seen in the Ofsted criteria, although there were matches. Some of the headteachers acknowledged the role of the criteria in being there to make judgements on teaching and they appeared to welcome having a framework (or baseline) which they could use – a framework which they could use to claim standardisation of their observations and judgements perhaps. In using Ofsted's criteria, be it the criteria for trainee teachers as they had been doing or the criteria for all teachers as they agreed would be more appropriate to use, the headteachers appeared again to comply with national requirements.

One possible reason for this may be found in successive government changes to teacher training. Ball (2003:57) argued that the increased centralisation of teacher training has led to a '...national curriculum for teacher training' which is focused on skills and classroom management. This, contested Oancea and Orchard (2012:576), led to the '...foregrounding of technique making practice amenable to control....via channels for regulation and sanction'. Ensuring the requirements of the national curriculum are met or exceed in their schools is a key role of headteachers.

Only three of the headteacher interviewed had experience of teacher training before the introduction of the national curriculum for schools and the majority only had such experience from the introduction of the literacy and numeracy hours where central control over the curriculum was further embedded. As this centralisation and control has become established it has formed the expectations of

the roles of headteachers, and other staff in school. Aligning teacher training to these expectations, by means of Standards and judgement criteria used by Ofsted, appears designed to break down established training practices linked to higher education and suggest to school that they are the better place for teacher training (Ball, 2003). The headteachers in this study were not convinced that this was true.

Another possible reason for the headteachers appearing to comply with centralised requirements may be found in the role of Ofsted in inspecting schools as, by coming into line with frameworks devised by Ofsted, the headteachers may perceive they are more likely to secure a favourable outcome for their schools. An example, perhaps, of what Courtney (2015) described as headteachers structuring their school to meet inspection objectives and which Ball (2003:224) suggested meant schools were ‘...driven by priorities, constraints and climate set by policy environment’. Within this is also the possibility that the headteachers perceived the Ofsted criteria did represent some aspects of what they were looking for when judging teaching and that, in a link back to their views on good teachers, it was about how the criteria were applied in context – the making of sophisticated judgements appropriate to the context (Kennedy, 2006; Sockett, 2009; Lunenberg and Korthagen, 2009). It may be that the headteachers believe they were able to interpret the criteria being used in context – with the context being in their schools – and make wise decisions in judging teaching. This may well be linked to the headteachers’ certainty about the role of primacy of practice in training teachers fit to teach.

The government intends that schools should take on increasing responsibility for teacher training because they assert that schools are the places, and they contain the best people, where trainees can learn to be teachers. Proponents of this ideology, and in particular Michael Gove, Michael Wilshaw and Charlie Taylor, announced they were giving school the freedom to do just this. But in reality trainee teachers will still be judged fit to teach through evidencing that they have met the Standards and their performances will be quantified through use of Ofsted criteria. Thus the central control of teacher training remains intact and schools will be required to comply with this control. The suggestions of greater freedoms for schools would seem somewhat overstated.

The headteachers in this study appeared willing to comply, yet their visions of what good teachers did went well beyond that which could be easily measured. This compliance is most likely to be part of the wider accountabilities which headteachers face, in what Hodgson and Spours (2011:146) described as the central policy levers of ‘...funding, inspection, targets and performance tables’. There have been no policy announcements to suggest that teacher training in school will be free from any of these controls; indeed the suggestion is that accountability will be rigorously pursued, so increased responsibility for teacher training in school will come with the same, or increased level of accountability the headteachers currently face. It is little wonder they appear willing to comply as this is what they are already required to do in other aspects of their role. One issue to arise from this is whether primary school headteachers will be willing to take on this additional accountability if they have the choice of participating or not in teacher training. The government’s

move to place greater responsibility for teacher training in schools is dependent on schools being willing to take this on. It may be that headteachers will comply with those directives they feel they have little control over, Ball's (2003:226) '...cynical compliance', but they may seek to gain control over aspects of teacher training where they believe they can exercise some control and choice. An example of this may be exemplified in the following theme.

'I know it when I see it'

Eight of the twelve headteachers believed they had the ability to identify good teachers, or potential teachers, early on meeting them. In terms of identifying the teachers, the headteachers believed this was about the teacher having a *presence* which the headteacher could use to indicate their ability and fitness to teach. This appeared to align to Rodgers and Raider-Roth's (2006:266) identification of presence as '...a state of awareness, receptivity and connectedness'. For potential teachers this was about the headteachers identifying them as the *right person* or the *person who fits*. There are links here to identifications of those with the '...genius to teach' as seen in selection of teacher-pupils in 1715 suggesting this belief in the ability to identify potential is an enduring presumption in education (Jones, 1938:101). Nonetheless, the headteachers found it difficult to explain how they identified presence or fit. Indeed two of the headteachers felt the need to defend their views because they perceived expressing such views did not appear to be very professional, something Rodgers and Raider-Roth (2006:284) noted when urging teachers '...not to be embarrassed' about identifying presence. The tension here is that this suggests the headteachers may be looking for teachers and

potential teachers who align with their own beliefs – teachers who they perceive to be the type of teacher they want to see in their schools perhaps – and this could have a number of implications if schools, and their headteachers, take the lead in the recruitment of trainee teachers.

Implications for recruitment

One obvious implication is concerned with equality of opportunity. If, as the government intend, schools play the lead role in teacher training this is likely to lead to headteachers being actively involved in the recruitment of trainee teachers. Indeed, some of the respondents in this study indicated that they wished to be able to make the choice of the trainees training in their schools. But having this choice brings with it the responsibilities associated with ensuring fair recruitment practices. Headteachers, and wider school personnel, are already involved in recruitment in the appointment of all staff to the school and thus should be aware of the need to demonstrate and apply all legal requirements associated with equal opportunities. In terms of the recruitment of potential teachers headteachers would need to ensure the same procedures are demonstrated and applied. But headteachers who believe they have the ability to judge early on the teaching potential of a candidate, and who perceive they are looking for applicants who fit their view of the school, may be looking through a narrow lens.

In looking at literature on how headteachers approached recruitment and selection, there was evidence that headteachers relying on their own perceptions and experience was common. Mason and Schroeder (2010) noted in their sample of sixty school principals that the majority of them, when recruiting teachers,

identified personal qualities such as appearance, excitement, self-confidence.

Rhodes, Brundrett and Nevill's (2008:313) identified that when recruiting staff for schools there was a '...reliance on the tacit knowledge of educational professionals, such as heads, gained through years of service'. Blake and Handley (1998:21) noted the headteachers in their study being '...quietly confident in their own insights into potential' and this was seen in the headteachers in this study. Raynor's (2014:40) research found headteachers faced with appointing staff looked for '...new staff [who] shared the mission and ethos of the school'. This was a view expressed by several of the headteachers in this study. There could be implications for the supply of teachers to the profession in primary schools taking the lead in training primary school teachers.

If teacher training is to be predominately undertaken in schools then many of these schools will need to participate in order to ensure teacher supply numbers. The average size primary school in England has between 180 and 220 pupils and thus perhaps seven or eight classes (DfE, 2013). This is likely to limit the number of trainee teachers in place in any one academic year and may mean many primary schools training just one or two trainees in an academic year. It appears reasonable for headteachers to be concerned about making wise choices of who they train, as the strategic performance of the school falls under their remit (Blake and Handley, 1998; Raynor, 2014). Nonetheless, increased responsibility for schools in teacher training may require headteachers to reflect on whether they perceive they are training a teacher fit to practise in their school or they are training a teacher fit to

practise in any primary school as a member of the teaching profession. It is not necessarily the case that these are the same things.

In the findings only three of the twelve respondents made reference to training teachers to join the teaching profession. Yet six of the respondents described their views that training allowed them to 'grow their own' teachers, with five respondents noting this as a strategy to support their schools in the recruitment of teachers. This may be particularly attractive to headteachers who struggle to attract applicants to their school and to those concerned with a potential teacher shortage in the coming years. It may also be attractive to those headteachers who perceive that their school has a way of teaching that needs to be replicated by every teacher in the school – a one-size-fits-all approach. Thus participating in teacher training will permit the trainee to be trained in the ways of the school and thus *fit* the school as a teacher after completion of their training, as suggested by Gove (2012) and Wilshaw (2014). Headteachers may consider the government approach as one which endorses their right to select the kind of trainee teacher they believe will fit their school because the current government approach assumes this signifies the trainee would also fit the teaching profession as a whole.

One potential consequence for the trainee in this approach may be that they are identified to be trained to be a teacher for a particular school. This could narrow the trainee's training to that which the school, and the headteacher, perceive to be good practice. Harris (2011:29) warned that such perceived good practice may lack transferability for trainees because it was '...highly situated and context bound' and this could limit trainee teachers in developing their own ideas and style of teaching.

Herein lies one of the main issues which might arise from a 'grow your own teacher' approach as an average primary school taking on one or two trainee teachers may perceive that absorbing that trainee into the school community will meet their training needs. Indeed, Michael Gove suggested just that when he declared that trainee teachers needed to '...learn their craft from the masters in school' (DfE 2012: Online). Because the schools where training takes place have been judged to be good or better, this allows a presumption that the practice of the school is that which trainee teachers should learn.

This approach suggests that there is little for trainee teachers to learn outside of the school but this was not what the headteachers believed, as seen in the findings and to be discussed further later in this chapter. Yet the most important factor to the headteachers was that the prospective trainee was the *right person* for their school and this is understandable because, in terms of recruitment, most of their experience has been gained in employing qualified teachers for their school. The headteachers starting point has thus been post-qualification selection of teachers but proposed national changes to teacher training imply that this automatically means the headteachers are competent to select pre-qualification teachers and to provide the training which leads to qualification judged against the Teachers' Standards (DfE, 2011). This again links to the views promoted by Gove (2012), Wilshaw (2014) and Taylor (2014) that schools were fully equipped to undertake teacher training because they were already running as institutions which educated pupils –a move which endorses Ball's (2003) view of a government believing a national curriculum approach is both for pupils and for teacher training. The

headteachers in this study did not agree with this but if given greater opportunities to select trainee teachers the headteachers may rely on their personal beliefs that they can identify the *right person* to train in their school.

Thus headteachers taking on more responsibility for selecting trainee teachers may benefit from greater consideration of how they might approach recruitment to teacher training. It may also be the case that those in government who are transferring greater responsibilities to headteachers should consider what training might be necessary to ensure headteachers, and schools, are fully equipped to meet their obligations in terms of the recruitment of applicants to the teaching profession. The most recently available figures for completion of teacher training show that ninety-one percent of trainee teachers on a post-graduate route were awarded QTS, with eight-seven percent awarded on undergraduate initial teacher training (DfE, 2015). These figures were similar to those for previous years, demonstrating that a significant majority of those recruited to teacher training go on to qualify as teachers. There were, however, differences in outcomes for some groups with male trainees, those of minority ethnic backgrounds and those with a declared disability recording lower success rates in being awarded QTS (DfE, 2015). Addressing issues of equity for these groups has been a focus for teacher training policy but the move to place responsibility on headteachers in primary schools to recruit entrants to teaching has the potential to weaken any progress. The headteachers in this study were most concerned with identifying potential teachers to fit in their schools. With this being their uppermost concern, and with primary

schools likely to be only taking a few trainees each year, opportunities could be narrowed.

In reviewing literature which discussed the idea that when involved in recruitment employers perceived they had the ability to identify the right person this was a belief shared beyond that of headteachers and those working in education.

Kutcher, Bragger and Maco (2013) reviewed a range of studies looking at recruitment and they identified that two main strategies are deployed. The first of these is ‘...person-job fit’ which is the match between the applicant’s knowledge and skills and abilities and the post for which they are applying. In terms of the headteachers this might include evidence in written application of the applicant’s commitment to teaching and for some of the headteacher it would also include the applicant’s qualifications (Kutcher, Bragger and Maco, 2013:294). The second strategy is what the authors identified as ‘...person-organisation fit’ which was the match between the applicant’s personal characteristics and the organisation’s cultural characteristics (*ibid*). This resonates with the headteachers’ perceptions that they are looking for the person who will *fit* their school.

Cable and Judge (1997) cited Schneider’s (1987) findings that this concept of fit suggested organisations and people were attracted to each other based on their similarity. This, the authors contended, led to people in the organisations believing they could accurately assess applicants’ personal characteristics but that this was a false assumption, what the authors identified as ‘...the interview illusion’ (Cable and Judge, 1997:547). Barrick, Swider and Stewart (2010:1164) noted that in their study of recruitment interviews that some interviewers made ‘...intuitive judgements

resulting in quick categorisation of individuals' and positive judgements were linked to perceived similarity. This, the authors suggested, then influenced some of the interviewers' assessments of the interviews where they perceived those applicants who they believed were similar to them as more competent in terms of the skills and knowledge they had which were relevant to the job. A tacit reliance on similarity has the potential to limit access to training places to for applicants from under-represented groups in teaching in England.

Writing specifically about teaching, Rodgers and Raider-Roth (2006:271) noted that applicants to teacher training may not reveal, or be aware of at that stage, their '...real teacher self' before their training and that, rather, this will be constructed during the training period. The result of this, the authors contended, can be that after training teachers can find their teacher identity does not fit with the school approach and this can lead to teachers having to '...artificially construct' notions of the teacher they are to enable them to fit in (Rodgers and Raider-Roth, 2006:272). This may prove to be unsustainable and could result in headteachers questioning their ability, and that of their staff, to select and train teachers. It may also impact on outcomes for teachers from under-represented groups where the lack of similarity hinders the support given to them in their training, highlighting differences rather than narrowing them. There is potential for a range of staff tensions to develop if training is perceived to be unsuccessful by any of those involved. It is feasible that having less than successful experience of teacher training could lead to schools questioning their involvement in such programmes and their capacity, and willingness, to participate in the future.

The potential for headteachers' own beliefs to influence their selection of applicants they perceive will be fit to practise brings challenges. The usual practice in a school is that a headteacher, working with senior staff and perhaps governors, takes the lead on recruitment. The government currently advocates that schools need to lead on recruitment to teacher training and they are the best places for that to take place. The assumption here is that this additional responsibility will fall easily into the school's existing recruitment practices and meet the needs of both schools and applicants to teaching. The challenge is whether doing this, especially in small schools training one or two teachers in any academic year, will result in selection to teacher training becoming a narrow process dependent on applicants finding a school where they appear to *fit*. This may limit opportunities for applicants who do not reflect the headteachers' notions of fitting the school. It may deter applicants from applying to schools where they perceive they may not fit. It could result in a fractured system of teacher training where apparently different selection criteria appear to be in use. This could create regional and local differences and bring in to question equality of opportunity for prospective teachers. It could be difficult to monitor the selection of prospective teachers on a national basis to identify trends and equality of opportunity.

If headteachers, as in this study, based their selection of trainees on their confidence in their ability to spot potential, then this may influence the training and subsequent qualification of the teacher as the headteacher may perceive a trainee to be more competent than they may be. This could result in trainees missing out on aspects of training that they need. There is potential here for other staff

involved in the training programme to be engaged in conflict with the headteacher if they assess the trainee differently. There is also the potential for a very 'cosy' training year where the trainees and schools fit together well but where the learning is so situated that it disadvantages trainees in terms of teaching in other schools during their careers. It must be added that there will be examples where this will work very well in schools where rigorous and challenging teacher training programmes are in place. What giving headteachers greater involvement in the recruitment of trainee teachers may do is to create an even more uneven process than is currently in evidence, whereby individual schools, and their headteachers, looking for perhaps one trainee, will be selecting applicants on the basis of their confidence that they are able to spot potential in applicants. Even if groups of schools get together to form interview groups for recruitment the findings from the headteachers in this study suggested that they would want the final say in the appointment of a trainee to their school.

This is not to say that concerns about effective selection processes are insurmountable as the literature suggested that recruiters who developed an awareness of how their perceptions could influence interviews and selection could adopt strategies to overcome this (Kutcher, Bragger and Maco, 2013; Cable and Judge, 1997; Garcia, Posthuma and Colella, 2008). Garcia (2004: Online) noted that this could be achieved by those responsible for recruitment '...being trained before interviewing candidates to avoid selecting candidates perceived as similar based on demographic characteristics'. The issue is whether the headteachers would consider they would benefit from such training given that it may call into question

aspects of their existing ability to recruit staff and to meet legal requirements for equality of opportunity. In addition there is the question of where this training would come from and how it would be funded. A government who believes that schools are already best placed to train teachers does not appear to be considering what additional support and resources these schools might need to ensure a fair system of selection.

‘A journey to get them to where it is you want them to be’

This theoretical code explored the headteachers’ views on how best primary school teachers could be trained in order to be fit to teach in their schools. The findings revealed the headteachers believed trainee teachers needed to have opportunities to practise teaching, which they identified as practice, and opportunities to study teaching, identified as theory, and that they should do these in appropriate locations. The headteachers discussed their perceptions of the current routes into teaching and expressed their preferences for future routes into teaching to produce the teachers they were seeking to employ. This section of the chapter discusses the headteachers’ views on: current routes into teaching; opportunities to practise teaching (practice); opportunities to study teaching (theory); where these opportunities might best be located; and their perceptions of future routes into primary teaching.

Current routes into teaching

All twelve headteachers interviewed had experience of teacher training, in schools they worked in, of the current three main routes to qualification for primary teachers: the Bachelor of Education route (BEd); the Post Graduate Certificate in

Education (PGCE); and the School Direct Salaried route (SDS) (previously known as the Graduate Teacher Programme (GTP)). From this range of experience it was hoped to draw some conclusions about the respondents' views on the strengths and weaknesses of these routes to inform discussion of what the headteachers would like to see in the future for teacher training to produce teachers fit to practise in their schools and to compare this to the changing landscape of training. It was not, however, the case that this was straightforward to achieve as the headteachers' views on current routes and their choices for the future were not seamlessly aligned.

In terms of the BEd route, and irrespective of their own route into qualification, the headteachers perceived this route to give trainees the time to study theory and to practise teaching in schools and they valued these undertakings in preparing trainees for teaching. The BEd was seen to attract those who had a commitment to teaching and wanted to study education. These views reflect those expressed by primary school headteachers in the IFS (2014) study where trainees on the BEd route received slightly higher scores in commitment to teaching and potential to be good teachers compared to trainees on the PGCE or SDS routes. Negative perceptions were about trainees starting at a young age when they may not have clear views about their choice of career and the perception that applicants to the BEd route may have lower qualifications than those applying to study subject degrees. According to the headteachers a concern for schools taking BEd students was that the schools had no choice of who they took for placements.

The one year PGCE received less support from the respondents, with only those whose own route was the PGCE seeing benefits to the route, and these were largely concerned with the more academic nature of PCGE trainees who would have studied a subject degree prior to commencing teacher training. This echoes concerns in the IFS (2014) study where primary headteachers ranked BEd trainees as having poorer subject knowledge than trainees on PGCE or SDS routes. It also links to a concern of the Carter review (2014) which suggested ITT programmes should have a more robust focus on the development of subject knowledge. The main objections to the PGCE was that it gave trainees insufficient time to study theory and to practise teaching, something the headteachers identified as contributing to the development of teachers fit to practise. These objections were the lack of time during the training year for trainees to develop their theoretical understanding and practical skills, as suggested by Murray and Passy (2014). As with the BEd, concerns were raised that schools could not choose their PGCE trainees.

Although the SDS route is also a one year course, the concerns about the PGCE route were not replicated here. This appeared to be linked to the level of control the headteachers perceived they and their schools had over the choice of the trainee and the training of the trainee. These factors were important to the headteachers and the findings suggested they outweighed the benefits identified for the other two routes. It appeared that, given the choice, having control over trainees in their school was the headteachers' main preference. This aligns well with government moves to situate teacher training predominately in schools and

suggests some headteachers may well be swayed by such arguments. If the government could allay the headteachers concerns about the SDS route, which were largely about the financial costs, they might be able to persuade headteachers to participate. If, however, the government's premises is that training teachers falls seamlessly into what a school already does and that additional funding is not required, then headteachers may be less willing to consider this type of school centred route (Alpin, 2001; Gove, 2012; Taylor, 2014; Wilshaw, 2014). The final decision may be a financial one rather than a philosophical one. Evidence, perhaps, that these headteachers believe that training teachers is run on the principles of the market place (Kydd, 1997; Blake, 1997; Ball, 2003).

Before discussing the headteachers' perceptions of the routes into teaching that they would like to see emerge from the changing landscape of teacher training, it is important to consider in more depth the respondents' views on what they identified as the two key elements of training designed to produce the type of teachers they were looking for: opportunities to practise teaching; and opportunities to study theories of teaching.

Practising Teaching – the role of practice

The findings from this study aligned with the perceptions of authors, amongst others, such as Hagger and McIntyre (2006), Malderz and Wendell (2007) and Grossman, Hammerness and McDonald (2009) that learning to be a teacher should primarily take place in schools. Indeed all the headteachers subscribed to Beck and Kosnik's (2002) concept of primacy of practice. This left the headteachers seemingly sharing the views of Gove (2012), Wilshaw (2014) and Taylor (2014) that teacher

training is best undertaken in schools, where apprentices can learn from the masters. This, however, does not tell the full story. The headteachers certainly perceived that the opportunity to practise being a teacher was the central core of teacher training, and that perception will be now be discussed, but this will be followed by a consideration of the headteachers' views on the role of theory in teacher training as the opportunity to study teaching.

Practice needed to lead teacher training, believed the headteachers, because teaching was best learned *on the job* where trainees could have the opportunity to practise '...professional craft knowledge' (Hagger and McIntyre, 2006:35). These opportunities to practise needed to take place in environments where the job was actually being undertaken – in authentic settings. The headteachers' use of terms such as 'what teaching really looks like' and 'the reality of teaching' suggested that they were looking to ensure trainees became classroom ready before going on to employment as Newly Qualified Teachers (Hayes, 1999). It also suggested that the headteachers, like trainees in studies by Furlong et al (2000), Williams and Soares (20002), and Hobson (2003), perceived that practice was more valuable to teacher training than theory.

This does then appear to support the government's view that teaching is best learned in schools. It could also be interpreted that headteachers were keen that trainees developed a realistic understanding of the work of teachers and of the challenges this presents – what the headteacher in the pilot study referred to as '...warts and all'. The most important characteristic of trainee teachers identified by these headteachers was commitment and they also perceived that good teachers

demonstrated a commitment that went well beyond just doing the job. It may be that the headteachers' identification of the 'reality of teaching' includes the 'warts and all' and, in training, this would allow trainees to develop, or see if they could develop, the competencies to do the job (Trotter, Ellison and Davies, 1997). The government, on the other hand, are focused on trainee teachers demonstrating their competence to do the job as measured through meeting the Standards (Trotter, Ellison and Davies, 1997). So whilst on the surface it may appear that these headteachers were in accord with government policy a closer examination suggests this may not show the full picture. The headteachers did not perceive the Standards to fully cover all that was required of teachers fit to practise and it may be that their focus on the reality of teaching is an exemplification of what one respondent meant when she said she expected her teachers to go 'beyond' the Standards.

One of the main means of sharing the realities of teaching with trainees was through being trained by staff who were actually doing the job of teaching, according to the headteachers. This in part is linked to Grossman, Hammerness and McDonald's (2009) concept of pedagogies of enactment where trainees learned through interaction with practitioners skilled in teaching (first-order practitioners, Murray and Male, 2005), an approach favoured by these headteachers. The headteachers perceived that pedagogies of enactment allowed practitioners to act as role models who could support trainees through giving them opportunities to observe, practise, discuss and refine teaching and thus they might acquire the professional knowledge of the teacher (Hargreaves, 1993; Moore, 1994). What the headteachers considered in less detail was how an approach like this, in one school,

might also narrow trainees' acquisition of professional knowledge. Black-Hawkins and Florian (2012) warned that this could result in the trainee acquiring learning which is heavily situated and which may not transfer to other contexts and this was a concern shared by Russell and Loughran (2007), Wang and Odell (2002) and Spendlove, Howes and Wake (2010). Indeed Grossman, Hammerness and McDonald (2009) warned of this by highlighting that pedagogies of enactment consisted of more than practice, as the practice required conceptualisation to enable trainees' learning and this should be undertaken by practitioners skilled in turning a critical lens on the study of core teaching practices, second-order practitioners, (Murray and Male, 2005).

In increasing the role of schools in teacher training, particularly an approach where schools lead the training, there will be a danger of teacher training becoming situated to a level which makes it difficult to transfer. Boyd and Tibke's (2013:42) expressed concerns that because each school setting was distinctive moving greater responsibility for teacher training to schools would lead to the emergence of '...a considerable variety of contexts and approaches'. This may create a climate of competence where the competence, measured by the Standards, is about being able to teach in that school. An example might be an academy chain, such as a Multi-Academy Trust, which takes over schools perceived to be underperforming by Ofsted. The academy chain proceeds to use its identity to turn an underperforming school into a school like its other schools. The academy chain also runs a teacher training programme which trains teachers to work in their schools to the standardised practices of the academy chain (Taubman, 2009). To do this they

recruit potential teachers who they perceive will fit the regime, someone they perceive to be like them. The danger here is a system of teacher training which is insular (Hiebert, Galimore and Stigler, 2002), and which is designed to meet the dominant discourse of performance and accountability (Ball, 2003).

There were some aspects of the headteachers' responses which suggested aspects of an insular approach to teacher training – their desire to recruit trainees who would fit their school, their belief that trainees learned about teaching best when in schools – but there were aspects where the headteachers identified with Grossman, Hammerness and McDonald's (2009) view that pedagogies of enactment were about practice but that they were also about opportunities for trainees to undertake clinical analysis of that practice. The headteachers appeared to agree with Eraut's (2004) view that experiential learning was essential to novices but they also needed to learn to bring their experiential learning under critical control.

Studying Teaching – the role of theory

The headteachers believed that in order to become teachers fit to practise there was training which trainee teachers needed to undertake to study teaching. The headteachers described as this as theoretical study; training which would support trainees to understand their experiential learning. Unlike their identifications of what constituted practice where the headteachers gave clear descriptions, their identifications of theoretical training were given in more general terms, suggesting the headteachers were less confident in discussing theory as opposed to their discussions of practice. Theory, according to the headteachers, consisted of academic work, theoretical study and reflection, and this required time away from

practice in school. This suggests the headteachers concurred with Grossman, Hammerness and McDonald's (2009) views on pedagogies of enactment whereby trainee teachers needed to have opportunities to study practice in order to develop their conceptual understanding of teaching. The headteachers gave some examples of what this might look like – studying appropriate subject knowledge, pedagogical approaches, child development, undertaking research and then being given the time to reflect on these to explore how they underpinned practice in school. These examples echoed Bowne and Reid's (2012) identification of the need for trainee teachers to be given opportunities to view practice through a critical lens and to reflect on what they find. These skills link to the headteachers' descriptions of the critical and analytical thinking they believed good teachers possessed and demonstrate that they were looking for trainee teachers to be trained beyond just that which could be achieved through practice.

Nonetheless there are tensions here as the headteachers viewed theoretical study as largely exploring what is done in schools – exploring what is believed to work (Eraut, 2004). They were, however, less forthcoming in going into any detail about exactly what this might constitute. This is not a criticism of the headteachers as their role would indicate that their focus would be on practice, so it is not surprising that they were able to discuss this aspect of teacher training in depth. Rather it illustrates that even though between them the headteachers had two hundred and thirteen years of teacher training experience, this experience was largely gained in a system which appeared to separate theory and practice. The findings of this study indicated that these headteachers valued both theory and practice in a teacher

training year and that they perceived schools to be the experts in providing the practice. The responses of the headteachers suggested that they perceived others outside of the school to be the experts in theory and to be better placed than school staff to offer trainee teachers opportunities to '...develop critical abilities to understand and assess teaching and learning situations and become prepared for new contexts' (Taylor, 2008). The challenge this brings is that the views of the headteachers are continuing to support the divide between theory and practice at a time when reforms to teacher training threaten the place of theory in the development of trainee teachers. Such an approach is unlikely to result in the reimagining of teacher education (Grossman, Hammerness and McDonald, 2009; Boyd and Tibke, 2013).

This tension between practice and theory is explored further by considering in more detail the headteachers' views about the locations of training.

Locations for the practise and study of teaching

The tension appeared to be about what the headteachers perceived to be the dichotomous nature of teacher training: the practical training, which they believed was best done in schools; and the theoretical training, which all but the headteacher of the teaching school, perceived was best done outside of schools. In order to develop to be a teacher fit to practise in a primary school a trainee, according to all the headteachers, required both practical and theoretical training. The headteacher of the teaching school believed skilled practitioners could undertake the entire practical and some of the theoretical training he perceived trainee teachers required. This is not unsurprising, perhaps, as this is a tenet of

being a teaching school, but he also acknowledged a role for experts outside of his school in areas he felt the school were unable to cover, which might involve working with outside bodies.

This was not, however, a view shared by the other headteachers. These headteachers were in accord with the views of Hagger and McIntyre (2006:64) who noted that the prime reason for involving experts outside of schools in teacher training was ‘...the access they can provide to bodies of theoretical and research-based knowledge, and even more their tradition of independent, critical inquiry central to the development of student teachers’ thinking’. The headteachers’ views aligned with the findings in the small-scale study by Boyd and Tibke (2013). The headteachers were looking for academic and pedagogical study beyond the school which would inform the trainee teachers’ understanding of teaching and learning, what Mansell (2010: Online) referred to as ‘...education as well as training’. For some of the headteachers this linked to their views on the critical thinking skills they expected to see in good teachers. This was evidenced in where they looked to the outside body to provide trainees with what Hodson, Smith and Brown (2012: 193) identified as ‘...the challenge to think’ and the headteachers’ beliefs that these bodies should act ‘...as an alternative voice, challenging trainee teachers to critique what they see’ (Harris, 2011:30).

The headteachers’ views exemplified Grossman, Hammerness and MacDonald’s (2009:274) beliefs that learning to teach should be constructed around ‘...a core set of practices for teaching’ which encompassed opportunities for theoretical study and for practice in order, and the views of Marshall (2015:84), that trainees had the

time to '...reflect on both pedagogy and research to develop the kind of practice that was needed'. Being given the opportunities to do this, believed the headteachers, would support trainees to become '...intellectually engaged teachers building a relationship between university sessions and their developing practice in school' (Smith, Hodson and Brown, 2013: 250). Undertaking such training may make it more likely that novice teachers will develop the critical thinking skills the headteachers perceived were needed by teachers fit to teach primary age children.

The headteachers believed that in order to provide trainee teachers with the most effective training the school needed to provide the opportunity for practice and to then work with a body outside of the school to provide the theoretical training to support that practice in a link to '...Dewey's curriculum of theory-in-practice dedicated to the understanding of theory-for-practice' (Shulman, 1998:519). This required a relationship between the school and the outside provider and the nature of this relationship was of concern to the headteachers. They expressed their desire to work in a partnership and there was a sense that this was not what they believed they had experienced when working with BEd and PGCE trainee teachers.

This is an important point to consider as the headteachers believed school to be the place where trainee teachers learned about the practice of teaching, yet they perceived that schools were not seen as equals to the trainees' providers or perhaps by the trainees' providers. This may explain the headteachers' responses which focused on the need for a true or equal partnership, what Booth, Furlong and Wilkin (1990:13) referred to as a '...partnership of reciprocal interdependence' where each partner's role was distinct and complementary (Burn, 2006). It also

demonstrated how important it was to the headteachers that their voice, or the voice of their school, had the same prominence as that of their partners. The headteachers appeared to be seeking what Gllroy (2014:631) described as ‘...a system of teacher education based on a genuine partnership, mutual respect and consensus’.

It was partnership with universities that was the most commonly mentioned by the headteachers. This is not a surprising as these headteachers have been in service when HEIs have been the predominant trainers of teachers, with figures showing HEIs had an eighty per-cent share of the training market in 2012 (UUK, 2014). This share is, however, falling quite rapidly and predicted to be around fifty-one per-cent in the academic year 2015-16 (UUK, 2014) and although other training providers, such SCITTs, Teach First and teaching schools may work with universities the traditional notion of HEIs dominating teacher training is disappearing. Indeed, Taylor (2014) identified September 2016 as the point when he believed the responsibility for teacher training would tip irrevocably in favour of schools.

It will be interesting to see how this changing nature of teacher training is perceived by serving headteachers, particularly those such as in this study who are looking for a significant input on theory from outside of their own school in order to enable successful teacher training. Hodson, Smith and Brown’s (2012:194) findings suggest the recasting of the role of universities in teacher training could open the way for more collaborative working of all those involved in training and create a platform whereby:

‘Capability is centred on a conception of theory concerned with producing generic teacher knowledge that can be adapted to meet the challenges of the ever-changing professional landscape.’

The headteachers in this study expressed their desire to work with HEIs and it may be that there is scope for a new, more collaborative relationship between schools and HEIs to emerge but this is likely to prove challenging in a climate where government policy seeks to limit partnership and put schools on their own in the front line.

It may well be that some forms of new, or adapted, teacher training partnership, consisting of a variety of members, will emerge in the coming years, particular if fears of a teacher shortage become a reality. Childs (2013:323), however, paints a pessimistic view of the role of HEIs in these partnerships suggesting they will be undermined by teaching school alliances and reduced to being ‘...itinerant teacher educators.....called upon as and when their expertise is needed by networks of schools or academies’. This was something the headteacher of the teaching school alluded to when he declared that most of the content of teacher training could be delivered by school staff. However, overall the headteachers in this study valued the work of HEIs and would like to work in a closer partnership with them. But there were echoes of Childs’ concerns (2013) in responses from the headteachers as they viewed schools as the main centre for trainees’ learning with that which schools could not do being provided by a body outside the school. There may be scope for HEIs and schools to look at how they currently work, consider the unique contributions each partner in teacher training can make and reimagine their partnerships in this changing landscape. This is unlikely to be an easy task.

To be successful, according to the headteachers interviewed, these partnerships needed to be equal and to recognise and utilise the different expertise each partner brings to the training. The partners would need to be working towards the common purpose – the training of teachers fit to practise. Hagger and McIntyre (2006:68) suggested that equal partnership is crucial but that ‘...even more important that the partners’ shared understanding of their different contributions is their shared understanding of the joint enterprise itself’. Davies (2006:14) suggested that the partners had to work to ensure the system was sustainable in order to:

‘...continue to improve to meet new challenges and complexities in a way that does not damage individuals or the wider community but builds capacity and capability to be successful in new and demanding contexts.’

Browne and Reid (2012:507) believed student teachers should ‘...be guided by the highest possible expertise during their study’ and they argued the role of HEIs in contributing to this. The headteachers in this study offered a similar opinion but they were also arguing for the role of best practice in their schools. Wilshaw (2014), Gove (2012) and Taylor (2014) made similar claims and it may prove attractive to headteachers to have this acknowledged in this way. It does appear to align with Wilshaw’s (2014) assertions that headteachers had told him they wanted more teacher training in schools because they were not satisfied with the school readiness of newly qualified teacher coming from some HEIs. Nonetheless the majority of headteachers in this study wanted to work with others, who they perceived to be experts in the study of teaching, to train teachers and it would benefit to explore further their perceptions of how this could be achieved.

The question is how to get all this best practice to trainee teachers to enable them to develop in to teachers fit to practise - there may be an opportunity here for schools and HEIs to engage in meaningful dialogue about teacher training and their respective roles. One way this may best be achieved is through examining existing links and initially on a small scale – a group of headteachers, similar to the twelve interviewed here, working with an HEI with whom they may already have a relationship. This will need to be a collaborative partnership recognising the equally legitimate roles of schools and HEIs in training (Furlong et al, 2000; Boyd and Tibke, 2013). Boyd, Harris and Murray (2007:14) suggested the potential of such a collaborative model as a ‘...tripartite arrangement between student, school-based mentor and university-base tutor’. This is likely to present challenges but these are the interested, and expert, parties in teacher training and in the supply of teachers, so it is to their benefit to be proactive in responding to change. The challenge is in meeting the pace of the current reforms. The headteachers’ views on what they perceived to be their preferred routes for training teacher fit to practise in their schools may give some perspective on the types of models of partnership they would support.

Preferred routes into teaching

Overall the single most popular route into primary teaching selected by the headteachers was the School Direct Salaried (SDS) route. This is the route where the trainees are employed by the school and spend the majority of their training year in the school that employs them. This may appear to be a contradictory choice given the headteachers’ perceptions that trainee teachers required opportunities to

study and reflect on theory away from their training school but this choice deserves further scrutiny. The headteachers selected the route they felt their school had most involvement with and the one in which they acknowledged they felt the most responsibility towards the trainee. It was also the route where the headteachers perceived they were able to exercise the most choice over the trainee for their school – the person who *fits* – and the most control over the training year. Any new partnerships with HEIs which emerge in the changing landscape of teacher training will need to take these factors into consideration.

With government policy offering leadership of teacher training to schools it could be tempting for schools to seize this because they believe they will gain a level of control over the training process that they perceive they do not have over the current BEd and PGCE routes. This might then result in Childs' (2013) prediction of HEIs being reduced to picking up that which the schools chose not to do being realised. HEIs who seek to work with schools in partnership will need to ensure that the schools are equal partners and to develop working practices which are truly collaborative and make best use of the strengths of the partners. It may be in this changing landscape of training teacher educators are prepared to do as Smith, Hodson and Brown (2013:250) suggest and '...act to reclaim their intellectual space in the field of ITE through asserting a new definition of their role' they may find support from primary school headteachers such as those who participated in this study.

The fact that the majority of the headteachers interviewed wanted to see a range of routes into teaching offers further support to teacher training providers. Teacher

recruitment was of concern to some of the headteachers and they were keen to see different routes offered in order to attract as wide a pool of potential primary school teachers as possible, what Rafferty (2010) referred to as ‘...opening the door to a glorious mix’ to ensure the needs of all pupils were met by their teachers and which goes some way to address issues about diversity and equality of opportunity. There was acknowledgment that some routes suited some applicants better than others. This is again an aspect of training that HEIs could pick up by in any new partnership arrangements to seek to establish more collaborative working practices with schools so that they might feel greater involvement with trainees on routes led by HEIs. There was some pragmatism shown by the headteachers in the acknowledgment that the cost of SDS route to primary schools limited the number of trainees schools could afford and thus there was the need for alternate routes to supply trained teachers. There were also concerns about recent and possibly future difficulties in recruiting teachers. These factors support schools and training providers exploring ways to work in partnership to train and supply teachers.

Another aspect of the headteachers’ perceptions of routes into teaching which contrasted with Childs’ (2013) views was in regard to teaching schools. The headteachers here, with two exceptions, were hesitant, and for some hostile, to the idea of working with teaching schools. The headteacher of the teaching school acknowledged this to be true. Hargreaves (2012:18) acknowledged these concerns as ‘...perfectly natural’ whereby headteachers feel ‘...anxious, threatened and defensive’ when they perceive another headteacher is trying to tell them how to run their school but suggested they could be overcome if school leaders were to

focus on what purposes they had in common and consider how working collaboratively might support them to achieve the purposes. The supply of teachers to employ in their schools would certainly be a common purpose for primary school headteachers. Taylor (2014: Online) acknowledged headteachers' '...nervousness' about working with teaching schools and said he understood why headteachers may not want to work with local schools due to issues of relationships and trust, and this links back to the headteacher of the teaching school's comments about perceptions of teaching schools as '...exclusive clubs'.

Taylor (2014) suggested headteachers could chose to work with larger, more national, networks but this was not a view shared by the headteacher of the teaching school who believed a teaching school should be '...a microcosm of a local authority because it delivers all the services but from within'. This links to the Carter Review (2015) which recommended that schools should participate in local teacher training. The headteacher of the teaching school perceived one reason for the reluctance of other headteachers to engage with teaching schools was in the manner the government portrayed them as an elite, suggesting a political agenda which was interfering with what should be the focus on '...grass roots education' because '...at the end of the day, we're all here for the children of our country and we must work for their benefit'. His comments link to Hargraves' (2012) point about the moral purpose of schools. In terms of teacher training, Hargreaves (2012) believed local schools working together in partnership could create a collective purpose – the training and supply of good teachers to work in local schools - and the head of the teaching schools concurred with this view. Although the other

headteachers wanted a supply of good teachers to employ in their schools they appeared unconvinced that schools working together under the leadership of a teaching school would serve their purpose.

So although Hargreaves' (2012) argument that local schools can work together on a common purpose could be applied in this instance to the supply of teachers, it is clear that more preparatory work, or perhaps a change in the emphasis of one school taking the lead over other schools, would need to be undertaken to convince the headteachers interviewed in this study that this was the way forward. In their reforms to teacher training the government may not have sufficiently considered the views of, or indeed consulted, primary school headteachers.

In this research study responses from the headteachers demonstrated how important it was to them that they were able to retain the autonomy over their schools that they believed they possessed. Government changes to teacher training for primary school teachers may necessitate primary schools working in some form of collaboration with other schools to create sustainable models of school-based teacher training. This would require new relationships to be established between schools and the headteachers in this study appear anxious about how this might happen. To establish such relationships schools and headteachers would need to '...cross boundaries' and to participate in '...a landscape of practice' (Wenger-Trayner *et al*, 2015). If the policy of teaching schools leading other schools in continued professional development, and in teacher training, is to develop, the type of resistant shown by the headteachers here will need to be explored, debated

and addressed and those leading teaching schools may need to be prepared to take the lead in doing this.

The headteachers valued theoretical input believing it essential to the preparation of teachers fit to practise but most believed they and their staff did not have the ability or time to provide this to the depth they felt was required – they were looking for those they perceived as experts to do this. If these headteachers, all leading good and outstanding schools, did not believe their school was capable of doing this, they may well need to be persuaded that another school, a teaching school, is capable of doing it. This is not to say that teaching schools are doomed to failure in terms of their role in primary school teacher training, it is much too early to make any judgement on this. What might be interesting to observe is the type of partnerships which emerge from teaching school alliances in the light of the type of reservations held by some of the headteachers in this study.

Growing your own teachers

An issue arising from the headteachers' perceptions of their willingness to participate in teacher training was that, as discussed earlier, some of them perceived this gave them the opportunity to 'grow their own teachers', particularly on the SDS route. What this appeared to mean was to grow teachers who would fit into the school and who were similar to the teachers the headteachers perceived to be their good teachers. This highlights the possibility of situated learning being at the core of a trainee's experience and creates a tension with the headteachers' descriptions of good teachers being the ones who are critical thinkers.

The headteachers believed trainees needed to study away from the school, that they needed theory as well as practice, but they viewed SDS trainees as their 'own', suggesting they felt greater ownership of them and their teacher training. If the headteachers feel that SDS trainees are their 'own', it may be that the SDS trainees perceive the training school and the headteacher to be their 'own' and that this could create a culture of dependence. In their training year SDS trainees are dependent on the school to provide the range of support required to allow them to meet the Standards and qualify as teachers. Many SDS trainees, as the government intends, stay employed in their training school during their NQT year, which again requires the school to monitor the NQT's progress and to confirm the NQT year has been successfully completed. The power in the relationship between the school and the trainee is with the school – the trainee is dependent on the school. After two years with the school the teacher, now fully qualified, could be what might be described as 'institutionalised' into the practices of the school – be doing what they are asked. It is difficult to see where any judgement could be made that this teacher was fit to practise, rather they fit to practise in that school.

This is not to say that this will be the case with every teacher trained through the SDS route who remains employed in their training school but it is something that headteachers may wish to reflect on in considering the SDS route, especially as this was the single most popular route into teaching identified by the headteachers in this study. It may be that the headteachers perceived the ownership of SDS trainees to be linked to viewing them as colleagues, as they are paid members of staff during their training year, rather than as trainees. This raises issues in terms of

assumptions made about the role trainees can play in their training year.

Government policy no longer identifies SDS trainees as supernumerary and thus allows trainees to undertake the role of class teacher from the first day of their training year. Headteachers who perceive SDS trainees as colleagues may be viewing them as teachers rather than teachers in training and this could lead to asking them to assume responsibilities too early and to under-estimating their training needs. This may lead to trainees having to conform to their immediate environment and adopt the practices they see in order to survive (Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Taylor, 2008).

It could be tempting to some headteachers to have the capacity to make use of trainee teachers as class teachers as there was evidence of pragmatism in the headteachers' comments on 'grow your own teachers' in terms of teacher recruitment and supply. The 'grow your own' movement began in the USA in response to teacher shortages, particularly in deprived regions of America (Swanson, 2011; Talbott, 2007). Several of the headteachers in this study were concerned with the supply of teachers for their schools and this concern does not appear to be misplaced. More teachers will be required in schools because primary school pupil numbers are expected to grow nationally by nine per-cent by 2023 (BBC2015a: Online). In addition Dr Mary Bousted, General Secretary of the Association of Teachers and Lecturers, noted that there was a '...crisis of supply' of teachers with only sixty-two per-cent of NQTs remaining in profession after one year (BBC, 2015b: Online). This rate of attrition is concerning and was something some of the headteachers mentioned; suggesting their awareness of the issue and

the impact it may have on recruitment. Growing your own teachers is thus likely to be attractive to headteachers who see it as one way to secure staffing for their schools, with perhaps an added advantage that this may lower the cost to schools of recruiting teachers. This could, however, be interpreted as an insular approach to teacher training and supply.

‘If you’ve said they can learn how to do their job at your school, then you have to give them the opportunity to succeed and make sure this happens’

The final theoretical code explored the headteachers’ perceptions about the responsibilities and roles of the school in teacher training to enable a trainee teacher to become fit to teach primary age children. The headteachers considered the type of primary school which they believed should participate in teacher training to include a school’s Ofsted grade, ethos and climate. The roles and responsibilities of headteachers, school-based mentors and other staff were considered, as were the opportunities teacher training in school might give schools to grow their own teachers. When reflecting on what they perceived needed to be in place in schools to allow trainee teachers the best training opportunities a number of the headteachers reflected on the external pressures which they perceived might prevent or limit a school from participating in teacher training and a discussion of these pressures concludes this section.

School grading

At the point of interview all twelve headteachers were leading schools graded at least good by Ofsted (Table 5.1) and this was, according to the IFS (2014), a typical picture of primary school involvement in teacher training where it found the

primary schools in its study to have an Ofsted average of 2.04 (with two representing a good inspection grade and one an outstanding grade). There appeared to be assumptions made by the headteachers that the Ofsted grade of a school indicated its suitability to train teachers and these were assumptions shared by Gove (2012), Wilshaw (2014) and Taylor (2014). Wilshaw (2014:Online) raised concerns about some trainee teachers having no idea of ‘...what good looked like’ because they had been sent to schools that did not employ good practice as measured by their Ofsted inspection grade. This, however, should be considered in terms of high quality of learning for *all* pupils in the light of concerns expressed by Wilshaw about evidence of unseen children underperforming in schools holding outstanding grades (Wilshaw, 2013:Online). An assumption that an Ofsted grade of good or outstanding indicates that all teaching in the school is at least good may provide a superficial overview which does not recognise issues of variance in teacher quality within schools (Hattie, 2009; Slater *et al*, 2012: Nield and Farley-Ripple, 2008).

Eight of the headteachers, however, believed that the Ofsted grade a school held should be taken into account when considering participation in teacher training and thus they appeared to be affirming Ofsted’s (2014: Online) view that the best schools, as judged by Ofsted, ‘...focus on high-quality teaching.’ It could be argued that this affirmation may be linked to the fact that it is in these headteachers’ best interests to agree with this because they lead schools which fall into this category. The headteachers were accepting this public accountability conferred by the Ofsted inspection regime because it suited them to do so – or because they felt they had

no power to do otherwise. There was little evidence in the findings that the headteachers accepted this accountability because they had confidence in the Ofsted regime itself. Rather this may be linked to the headteachers' perceptions that schools with grades of at least good experienced fewer outside pressures and thus that they, as headteachers, had more control over their schools. Having control over their schools was very important to the headteachers interviewed.

This is one example of the power of a school Ofsted grade in branding the school and may go some way to explaining the headteachers' views of the impact of Ofsted inspections on schools which are considered later in this section. It may also offer some explanation for the headteachers' use of language in a manner which could be described as in Ofsted terms – 'categories', 'requires improvement', 'good', 'outstanding' – in the interviews. In a regime of high public accountability it is essential that those leading publically accountable bodies, such as headteachers in schools, must be fully aware of the system by which they will be held accountable and ensure their school is prepared to meet this system when inspected. It is little wonder then that the headteachers appeared to have adopted the language of Ofsted as they are subject to a system '...based on monitoring and appraisal and outcome-driven' (Gerwitz, 2002).

On the surface the headteachers also appeared to make the assumption that if other schools held similar Ofsted grades to their school then they were as suitable to participate in teacher training as their school was – perhaps in a link to earlier ideas about making a judgement that someone will fit an organisation being partly based on perceived similarity. However, this may not address the entire issue of the

assumptions made by the headteachers as there was hostility to the idea of their school being led by a teaching school in the training of teachers, even though a teaching school would hold an Ofsted grade of outstanding.

The headteachers appeared to accept Ofsted measures when it suited them, although this is an over-simplification of headteachers' complex relationship with bodies such as Ofsted. Of the twelve headteachers interviewed only three had experience of teacher training before the creation of Ofsted. Of these three headteachers, one suggested that trainee teachers should only train in schools with Ofsted grades of good and outstanding and the two other headteachers made no comments on this. For the remaining nine headteachers Ofsted has been an integral part of their professional experience of teacher training, and of teaching, and this is likely to have contributed to the assumptions they made. There may also be some pragmatic reasoning by the headteachers in terms that they accepted, willingly or otherwise, that Ofsted was the method by which their school was held accountable and thus when it suited the headteachers to accept Ofsted judgements they did but that when it did not suit them, and they perceived they had the power to do so, they chose to reject them. Another example of Ball's (2003:226) '...cynical compliance' perhaps. What this does suggest is that where headteachers believe they have a choice they may exercise their authority and opt for non-compliance. Government proposals to place more teacher training in schools may be reliant on headteachers opting to participate and headteachers choosing to do otherwise may be something not fully considered in changes to teacher training.

There are other issues which arise from the premise that teacher training should only be permitted in schools which hold good or outstanding Ofsted grades. The first of these is the exclusion of those schools not meeting this requirement. The Ofsted Annual Report for 2013/14 (2014a: Online) stated that eighty-two per-cent of primary schools held grades of good or outstanding in July 2014. It might be argued, as some of the headteachers did, that the other eighteen per-cent of schools should not participate in teacher training because they had too much else to do in terms of improving sufficiently to meet the Ofsted criteria for a higher inspection grade. However the headteacher of the teaching school perceived that this presented the opportunity for such schools to work with teaching schools in terms of weaker schools, in Ofsted terms, being supported by stronger schools. This, he argued, could allow them to participate in teacher training under the direction of a higher graded school than them. Not unsurprisingly this was supported by Wilshaw (2014) and Taylor (2014), strong advocates of the teaching school system. Wilshaw (2014) suggested doing this would allow that less secure schools (in terms of Ofsted grades) to participate in teacher training as part of an alliance in order to access good trainees and subsequently good teachers. This could, however, lead to teaching school alliances being predominantly one outstanding school supporting a number of underperforming schools (as identified by their Ofsted grades) and this would bring into question the capacity of a teaching school, particular in the primary sector, to meet the needs of the schools.

In addition a continuing policy of excluding primary schools not judged to be good or better from teacher training could deprive them of opportunities for

development which might support the school. It may also deprive them of teachers who chose to work in these schools, as noted by Ofsted (2014b: Online) as '...not attracting or retaining teachers of the right calibre' and in concerns expressed by Wilshaw (2014: Online) and Taylor (2014: Online). The tension here is that Ofsted, Wilshaw (as Her Majesty's Chief Inspector of Schools) and Taylor (as head of The National College of Teaching and Learning) appear to be happy to exercise the power to give schools labels in terms of grades and then complain that high quality teachers are not attracted to schools given labels of requires improvement or inadequate. A tenet of a market place approach to public services such as education is offering choice through comparison, so teachers choosing not to work in schools deemed in need of improvement is perhaps unsurprising.

Another issue arising from the premise of using a school's Ofsted judgement as the entry criteria to teacher training is that it may prove to be a difficult measure to sustain. School circumstances can alter, headteachers and key staff leave, performance measures can be changed leading to changes in Ofsted grades. These were factors noted by the headteachers interviewed and linked to Ball's (1997:317) proposition that schools were organisations which '...change, drift, decay and regenerate'. This could lead to primary schools being faced with an inconsistent approach to participation in teacher training and prove unsustainable in the long run. However, if teacher training continues to move towards schools other providers, such as HEIs, are likely to reduce or cease their participation. The sustainability of primary school-centred teacher training would therefore appear to be a key consideration.

In the findings the use of the term 'willingness' by some of the headteachers when discussing participation in teacher training was an interesting one. It suggested the headteachers perceived there to be a level of choice in whether to accommodate teacher training in their school. As seen earlier, choice and control were important issues for the headteachers interviewed. This has implications for the move to place more teacher training in schools as it makes the assumption that schools are willing to do this. The headteachers perceived they currently have the choice of participating in teacher training, and HEIs running BEd and PCGE programmes will testify to the challenges of securing sufficient placements for their students. If more responsibility and workload for teacher training is passed on to schools, but schools are unwilling to take this on, it may be that headteachers believe they will be able to exercise their prerogative and decline to participate. The government appears to have assumed that primary schools are willing and eager to take more responsibility for teacher training. Whether this will be the case remains to be seen but the responses of the headteacher in this study suggest greater consultation with primary school teachers about proposed changes to teacher training may have been of benefit to any overall strategy.

School climate

The creation of a climate in a school which would sustain successful teacher training was an emerging theme from the data and the headteachers interviewed believed that the creation of such a climate was their strategic responsibility. The overriding sense from the headteachers' responses was that they wished to ensure that the climate of their school enabled participation because they believed that this would

give a trainee the best opportunity to develop the practices to support their fitness to teach. The headteachers wanted a climate which welcomed and included trainees as part of the school community and which contained expert practitioners willing, and able, to work with trainee teachers. The headteachers perceived that opportunities for trainees to practise teaching were an essential, and for some of the headteachers *the* essential, part of their training and that school was where these opportunities would be found. Thus it was the responsibility of schools to accommodate this, to foster learning (Senge, 1990).

The climate the headteachers perceived would support trainee teachers was one where learning was at the centre of what the school did, what Lieberman and Pointer Mace (2009) defined as a professional learning community. In terms of adults' learning the authors identified this as a community where trainee teachers, as novices, could be exposed to an articulation of the complexities of teaching. This articulation comes from the experienced teachers, the masters. The influence on Gove's (2012) premise of novices learning from masters is clear – teachers learning their craft in the community where the craft is practised. The Ofsted grading of the school, according to Wilshaw (2012), should serve to certify that it is a community with good, or outstanding, practices, what Wenger-Trayner *et al* (2015: 15) described as '...a respected community of practice'. It is clear that this could be appealing, and flattering, to headteachers – it acknowledges them as leaders of communities where good practice takes place. It also supports the notion of the primacy of practice, whereby practising teaching is perceived to be the most

important aspect of training, something the headteachers in this study believed to be the case.

Thus it could be argued that placing the responsibility for teacher training in schools is a logical step. The headteachers in this study, along with senior people in government, espoused the primacy of practice in training to be a teacher – finding out *what teaching was really about* – and doing this in an authentic community (Lave and Wenger, 1991). The headteachers exemplified the views of Wenger (1998) on the three key elements to a community of practice. The first was that the community was a place where there would be a shared interest – exemplified here by the willingness of the headteachers to accommodate teacher training because they perceived trainees would learn best by having opportunities to practice their teaching in the place where teaching was required – in the school. The second and third elements were focused on members of the community who were willing to participate and in the community having sufficiently skilled numbers of practitioners who could support trainees. These two elements were considered by the headteachers when they spoke about the crucial roles of school staff in supporting teacher training in schools. In identifying the need for a climate supportive of trainee teachers, the headteachers appeared to go some way in acknowledging that relationships in such communities were crucial to success (Maynard, 2001; Hodkinson and Hodkinson, 2004; Hargreaves and Fullan, 2012).

It may be tempting to accept the vision of teaching as a craft best learned in a community of practice where that craft is undertaken by those who have mastered it. Yet there are tensions between any assumptions that placing all or the majority

of teacher training in schools is the way to train teachers. The views of the respondents on the role of schools in this training, as well as their views on the training needed beyond the school illustrate this tension. Responses from the headteachers, who all had experience of the three main routes into primary teaching, indicated that they believed a climate to allow trainees to do this in schools needed to be created – and they did not see this as something in place in every school. They believed they had the responsibility of strategically leading and monitoring such a climate, suggesting such actions required the level of leadership skills expected of headteachers (Crow, 2007; Earley and Wilding, 2007). Responses from the participants in the study identified a number of elements which contributed to this climate which went well beyond any simplified notion that because schools educate pupils they therefore could easily train teachers.

The findings from the pilot study, supported by those in the main study, demonstrated the crucial role the headteacher played in creating the circumstances which allowed all those involved in teacher training in the school to play their roles effectively and create opportunities for a trainee to succeed. There is a danger that less experienced headteachers, or headteachers who have not been able to fully consider the ramifications of taking on more responsibility for teacher training, may be swayed by government arguments and believe their schools are fully equipped to take on more teacher training. One possible outcome to this may be the kind of situated learning which limits a trainee's development as a teacher (Harris, 2011; Black-Hawkins and Florian, 2012). Another outcome may be that the relationships in the community of practice either fail to establish or break down due to lack of

preparation, management or to unclear expectations. This outcome has the potential to be detrimental to the school and the professional relationships within the school on a number of levels, particularly in primary schools where there may be a relatively small number of staff compared to secondary schools. A difficult training year in their school could force a headteacher to reconsider the school's involvement in teacher training, particularly if teachers were unwilling to take on responsibility for mentoring trainee teachers. But the government plans to site most teacher training in schools makes it imperative that a high number of schools consistently participate in the training. It may have been to the long-term benefit of changes to teacher training to have consulted at length with primary school headteachers in an effort to develop an understanding of their perceptions of what is needed in schools to promote successful teacher training. This understanding could then have been shared to provide guidance for primary schools. The headteachers in this study were clear in their views of what need to be in place in primary schools to support teacher training in terms of the prevailing climate in the school and the roles and responsibilities of staff.

The role of the headteacher

Bitan, Haep and Steins (2014:5) suggested headteachers were '...particularly responsible for the school's climate' and this was evident in the responses of the headteachers. They felt it was their responsibility to create a climate in their school where trainee teachers could succeed. The headteachers believed this required leadership from them to include judgements on key staff to work with and support trainees. Maintaining a strategic overview of the training, monitoring progress and

stepping in if there were problems were seen as key undertakings for the headteachers and these approaches reflected some of the overall work responsibilities of primary school headteachers.

Increased provision for teacher training in schools is likely to increase this workload and this is something headteachers may wish to consider as it brings into questions the capacity for primary school headteachers to take on this type of role in addition to all their existing responsibilities. This links to Earley and Weindling (2007:76) suggestion that contemporary headteachers now have to ‘...manage major multiple initiatives while at the same time attempting to shape the culture of their school’. Headteachers might wish to look at the example of two of the headteachers here and consider creating a defined role, which could be filled by a middle leader, creating what Portner (2005) identified as a school-based professional teacher training mentor. This person would take the strategic overview of teacher training in the school, relieving the headteacher of that day-to-day responsibility. In delegating this role the headteacher would also be contributing to leadership development in the school (Bush, 2013; Crow, 2007), but this development, advised Lock (1995: 315), needed to be ‘...part of the school’s development plan and not a bolt-on extra’. Lock’s (1995) point is particularly relevant to the current situation where schools are being urged to take on greater responsibility for teacher training. The premises seems to be that this can be ‘bolted-on’ to what schools already do but the findings from this research, and from literature, suggest this will be much more complex than just adding to schools’ current responsibilities.

If schools do take on more and varied responsibilities towards teacher training, and they do this in a climate of public accountability, the need to distribute leadership roles will be crucial. This may be challenging in primary schools, especially small schools, in terms having a sufficient number of staff able and willing to take on these responsibilities in addition to their existing responsibilities. The average secondary school has 940 pupils whilst the average size primary school in England has between 180 and 220 pupils (DfE 2013). It may be that part of the drive to increase teacher training responsibilities in schools is based on a secondary school model and thus more viable in terms of flexibility of staffing. Primary schools, especially small primary schools, with smaller numbers of trainees have less flexibility and perhaps this is one of the factors which might compel them to work in alliances with other schools, particularly teaching schools. This is unlikely to reduce the workload of the primary school headteacher, however, as responses from the headteachers have indicated their unwillingness to cede decision making about their school to another school. The headteachers in this study perceived it was their responsibility, and perhaps their prerogative, to make the decisions in their school. Crow (2007: 53), however, suggested that as headteachers responsibilities have increased, in order to manage these responsibilities leaders will have to ‘...have the dispositions to move the school forward and encourage the development of norms, for example, contributing to learning communities’. It may be that putting teacher training into the front line of the work schools undertake will require, or in some cases perhaps force, headteachers to reassess some of the beliefs they hold about their roles and responsibilities as leaders.

The role of the school-based mentor

One of the key decisions the headteachers in this study believed they made was in the selection of staff to be school-based mentors to trainee teachers. They selected a school-based mentor carefully and made judgements about the mentor's own practice. In a recurring theme it appeared they were looking for a teacher that they wanted the trainee to strive to be like – the issue of similarity again. The headteachers chose their 'best person' to be the mentor who could demonstrate best practice to the trainees, who in turn might take this on their practice. This increases the chances of situated learning taking place but this was what the headteachers wanted to see. These were headteachers leading schools with Ofsted grades of good and outstanding and it may be that they perceived the type of learning which took place in their school to be validated by Ofsted, the body responsible for the public accountability of schools. Hattie's (2003) review of evidence concerned with teacher quality suggested that within schools there would be variation in teacher quality and thus on impact on pupil learning. This variation was summarised as being the difference between experienced teachers and expert teachers (Hattie, 2003). It may be that the respondents' identification of their 'best person' has some links to the idea of expert teachers and suggests acknowledgment that within these good and outstanding schools it may not be the case that all teachers could be identified as expert teachers.

Mentoring trainee teachers had professional development opportunities for school-based mentors, according to the headteachers. They perceived that it created opportunities for the mentors to reflect to their own practice in teaching and

learning, exemplifying Carney's (2003:414) view that participation in teacher training enhanced opportunities for experienced teachers '...to think about and build upon their own teaching'. There was an appreciation from the headteachers that engaging in teacher training was not a one-way activity for schools where they were simply playing the role of host to trainees but that there were continued professional development benefits to the school staff from participation. Coldron *et al* (2003) surveyed leaders of schools participating in teacher training and reported that senior staff recognised the contribution participation made to the professional development of teachers in their schools in terms of developing leadership and coaching skills and providing opportunities for teachers to re-evaluate their own practice. Schools which take this holistic view of participation in teacher training may well be better equipped to sustain their involvement in training because they are able to view it as an integral part of the life of the school.

One of the main criteria deployed by the headteachers for selection of mentors was that the mentor was able to engage in professional dialogue – to talk about teaching and learning in manner accessible to the trainee. The headteachers perceived that trainees needed to have expectations, to include those contained in the Teachers' Standards (DfE, 2011) and the Ofsted criteria (2009), broken down into smaller steps and articulated by those who understood how taking these smaller steps would support a trainee to progress to meeting the expectations. The focus here was on classroom practice and management (Ball, 2003). As a result of this there could be variable outcomes for trainees, from the mentor who instructs the trainee to copy the practice they have observed to the mentor who encourages

the trainee to reflect on what they have seen, to research and discuss it, and to find their way of meeting the expectations. In a school-based system with few chances for mentors to work beyond their own schools it could be difficult for mentors, particularly those new to the responsibility, to develop their own knowledge, skills and understanding in working with trainee teachers.

A concern for some headteachers was that school-based mentors had the skills to work with adults. This may be a particular concern to headteachers of primary schools, rather than secondary schools, where teachers are trained to teach pupils up to the age of eleven. Government policy appears to assume that if a teacher can teach pupils they can train teachers but the headteachers in this study were less certain of this. There were particular mentions of the skills involved in teaching adults and judgements on the possession of these skills were made by headteachers in identifying school-based mentors (Turner-Bisset, 2001: Knowles, 1980). Part of these skills in adult learning were about the ability to provide feedback to trainees which allowed them to improve their practice, as the headteachers identified this as crucial to success and which linked to the findings in studies by Edwards and Protheroe (2004) and by Maynard (2000).

The role of feedback was also identified as a crucial factor to the success of the trainee teacher in the pilot study, as was the organisation of the in-school training programme which created regular time during the school week for the trainee and the mentor to meet, as well as allowing time for informal meetings throughout the week. Lofthouse and Hall (2014) suggested that timetabling such meetings was crucial to creating a climate where productive professional dialogue was seen to be

highly valued. This is demanding of schools participating in teacher training in requiring an organisation which creates the time for regular meetings to underline the value it puts on feedback to trainees. In the time created the mentor is expected to provide a quality of feedback that will allow a trainee to make progress. It has been my experience, both when working in school and in HEI, that this can be one of the most variable aspects of in-school support for trainee teachers and several of the headteachers alluded to this when they noted they selected their mentors very carefully. This variability was also noted in the literature (Brooks, 2000; Turner-Bisset, 2001; Jones and Straker, 2006; Webb *et al*, 2007; the Carter Review, 2015). The literature suggested this to be an issue that has longed challenged all those participating in teacher training, to include the Carter Review (2015) identifying it as a key aspect on which to focus in teacher training reforms. Thus the focus should be on researching how school-based mentors could be prepared to provide the quality of feedback which would impact positively on the progress of trainee teachers. A policy which appears to suggest schools are fully equipped to accept responsibility for teacher training may mislead school staff, and trainees, into believing little preparation is needed. A more school-based programme of teacher training is likely to result in school-based mentors having fewer opportunities to work with those outside of their school and thus limiting their access to professional dialogue which may support them to develop their mentoring practice. One outcome could be to increase the variability in the quality of feedback provided to trainees depending on the school in which they train at a time when a national review of teacher training has identified the need to lessen

such variability. It may prove particularly challenging to monitor any progress in reducing this variability in small primary schools training one or two teachers a year in a school-based system. This variability may, however, have a significant impact on the training of individual trainees and could be a deciding factor in how well the trainee achieves in their training year. In a school-based system potential teachers may need to consider their choice of schools very carefully indeed.

The headteachers in this study were clear about the criteria they looked for in appointing school-based mentors – outstanding practice, the ability to engage in professional dialogue and the skills to work with adult learners to include being able to provide feedback which enabled the learner to improve. This was quite a demanding list but it was interesting to note that there was little discussion about any training that these mentors might require or from which they might benefit (Brooks, 2000; Jones and Straker, 2006; Webb *et al*, 2007; Ulvik and Sunde, 2013; the Carter Review, 2015). Rather there was an assumption that the headteacher was choosing a mentor who they thought was already equipped to do the job. There might be a parallel here with the government's assumption that schools have everything they need to train teachers.

Webb *et al*'s (2007) study of the specific training programme a group of school-based mentors undertook to develop effective mentoring practices for use with trainees in school suggested school-based mentors needed time and training to fulfil their role but that due to the constraints of time and funding any training given to mentors was often only about familiarisation with the procedures and paperwork. If more teacher training is moved to schools this may be something

headteachers will need to consider. This in turn raises questions about funding and resources to support the development of teacher training in schools.

The role of other staff

Trainee teachers needed to work with staff beyond their school-based mentor, according to the headteachers, to access their expertise (Brooks, 2000). This links to the identification of a community of practice as described by Wenger (1998) whereby a range of experienced practitioners shared their repertoire to support and develop a novice, the people who Wenger later described as ‘...practising members of good standing of a respected community of practice’ (Wenger-Trayner *et al*, 2015: 15). There were assumptions by the headteachers that other staff should be willing to engage in teacher training, something Hobson (2013) noted was not always the case. There was also an assumption, perhaps linked to the credibility the school’s Ofsted grades were perceived to grant, that other teachers in the school would be appropriate role-models for trainee teachers. Studies by Hattie (2009), Slater, Davies and Burgess (2012) and Nield and Farley-Ripple (2008) suggested teacher variance within schools was prevalent and this could lead to trainees having poor training experiences.

The challenge will be to create a climate within the school which enables all staff to be able and willing to contribute to teacher training, as there is a danger that otherwise it could be viewed as increasing teachers’ workload and they may not perceive any benefits from doing this (Carney, 2003). Additional responsibilities to school staff at a time when the government is claiming action to reduce teacher workload may not be welcomed by all teachers (BBC, 2015c).

Schools which seek to add greater responsibility for teacher training to their workload may benefit from an agreed and understood whole-school policy which addresses concerns about any increased workload. This consideration has not been prominent in any government explanations of changes to teacher training where they appear to highlight the freedoms the changes give schools. Primary school headteachers may wish to consider the potential cost of such freedoms, with headteachers in this study expressing their concerns that these freedoms attempted to achieve teacher training 'on the cheap'.

External pressures

The headteachers perceived they had a choice of whether they, and their school, participated in teacher training. There were external pressures on school which they identified as having the potential to limit their participating in teacher training or increased teacher training – specifically: the Ofsted inspections regime; whether schools should be expected to take on more responsibility for teacher training; and resources issues which were largely concerned with finances. There was an additional issue that the headteachers perceived impacted on teacher training – that prospective teachers were being put off applying for teacher training by the way teaching was portrayed in some areas of society.

The role of Ofsted was particularly highlighted as a negative force even though these headteachers, in Ofsted terms, could be described as leading successful schools. The headteachers were concerned that Ofsted inspections required so much focus on their school and their existing staff that this could limit them in participating in teacher training – especially in a year where an inspection was

expected. The headteachers perceived part of their role to be one of defending or protecting their staff against Ofsted, something seen in Courtney's (2013) study of headteachers' responses to Ofsted.

There was also a sense that the headteachers perceived they, as leaders, were not trusted to run their schools – the government sends in inspectors to judge (Ranson, 2003). These headteachers accepted Ofsted grades as validating the participation of schools in teacher training but they were less certain about accepting the Ofsted process in its current form and the impact they perceived this had on their schools. This suggests they may have experienced what the findings of Case, Case and Catling's (2000:618) study uncovered in that even if successful in Ofsted terms school staff believed there was no positive impact on effectiveness or achievement but rather '...negative influences of what they perceived to be heavy handed and excessive accountability'. Perryman (2007:188) found a similar picture in her study where '...the emotional impact of inspection, with its fear and loss of control and a sense of self, in the worse cases lead to teachers being unable to continue their work'. If this is considered alongside Muijs and Chapman's (2009) view that headteachers are at the centre of any school inspection, this may offer explanation for the need of some of the headteachers interviewed to protect their staff.

It may also suggest that, in preparation for inspections, the headteachers are engaged in what Ball (2003) describes as performativity, doing what they need to do to meet external measures and expectations, to enable good outcomes - what one of the headteachers called the 'Ofsted game we play' (Jeffery and Woods, 1998), and what Gunter (2012:13) referred to as '...the leadership game'. There

were tensions here between the times the headteachers appeared to accept and utilise Ofsted grades and their views of the inspection process. Courtney (2015) suggested there is a level of compliance amongst headteachers who structured their school to meet inspection objectives. Ranson (2003:468) suggested that the intensity of public scrutiny in events such as Ofsted inspections can lead to those with the greatest responsibility being so preoccupied by the need to perform that it leads to the ‘...fabricating of performance, constructions, and sections of the truth produced to create the most beneficial account’. It is perhaps little wonder that the most experienced headteacher interviewed for this study noted that Ofsted inspections generated fear in headteachers.

In a speech in March 2015 Sean Harford, Ofsted National Director of Schools, appeared to go some way to addressing these concerns by outlining a new approach by Ofsted to schools already judged good or better in announcing:

‘There will be a radical change to the way we inspect good schools ...more frequent but shorter inspections, with a strong emphasis on professional dialogue’.

(Harford, 2015: Online).

It will be interesting to see if this has an impact on the headteachers’ perceptions of the effect Ofsted inspections have on schools. In addition, Initial Teacher Training programmes are themselves subject to Ofsted inspections and thus any school taking on greater responsibility for teacher training may reasonably expect to have this aspect of their work inspected by Ofsted. There was no sense from the headteachers in this study that they would welcome any additional inspection regime.

The level of scrutiny of schools, to include Ofsted inspections, and the narrowness of the focus to that which could be measured contribute to a lowering of the status of teachers in society suggested the headteachers, and this links to Brown, Ralph and Brember's (2002:11) views that there was a perception amongst teachers that '...the general community does not value or appreciate, in either sense of the word, what teachers and schools do'. Ozga (2000:26) had a similar view, suggesting political and media criticism has created a poor public image of teaching and left teachers feeling undervalued. This type of criticism has, however, served successive governments well in creating a public climate which allows their reforms to be seen as justified to meet the criticisms expressed.

For some of the headteachers there was the belief that recent government policy initiatives in teacher training demonstrated a lack of understanding of the demands of teaching and suggested teaching was easy. Tomlinson (2005:220) agreed with this view and suggested this had occurred because the successive government reforms had resulted in the view that teachers were '...technicians who needed to be trained to deliver a prepared curriculum'. Ozga (2000:26) suggested that the government reforms had led to the '...routinization of teaching' and this had made teaching '...unattractive to graduates looking for intellectual challenge'. Grossman, Hammerness and McDonald's (2009:273) cautioned that taking such a simplistic view masked the reality that '...teaching is complex work that looks decidedly simple'. The headteachers in this study believed this to be true and were looking for teachers with the ability to think critically as they perceived this to be a hallmark of their best teachers, a view supported by literature (Hay-McBer, 2000; Kennedy,

2006; Sockett, 2009). Yet they perceived that government reforms to be dissuading such people from becoming teachers.

Some of the headteachers believed prospective teachers were also put off by the belief that teachers were constantly being scrutinized and monitored, and this resonated with views expressed by teachers in studies by Hall and Noyes (2009) and Case, Case and Carling (2010). Tomlinson (2005:220) believed that reforms had deprofessionalised teaching and led to '...low morale and a crisis in teacher recruitment'. Aspfors and Bondas (2013) summarised a range of studies looking at teacher retention and noted common themes for leaving the profession to be: stress; burnout; lack of support; low salary; and low status. Recent research has suggested that '...more than half (59%) of teachers have considered leaving teaching in the last six months and for those that have considered leaving in that period, workload is by far the most important reason for this (Menzies *et al*, 2015:19). The headteachers interviewed perceived these issues to be real and present in their schools. They also perceived it was their role to try to protect their staff from the impact of some of the reforms, especially in terms of inspections.

There was also concern about teacher recruitment expressed by some of the headteachers and greater involvement in teacher training was attractive to them if they perceived that this would let them 'grow their own' teachers and thus help them to avoid a recruitment crisis in their own school. There is a danger that this will lead to some headteachers becoming insular and perceiving their role to be that of protecting just their school. This, in turn, heightens the chances of teacher training becoming increasingly situated in the school, potentially limiting

opportunities for trainees. It may also allow headteachers to believe they should decide whether, and when, the school will participate in teacher training. They may only do this to meet their recruitment needs and this thus call into question the issue of teacher training being wholly school-led. If teacher training does become wholly school-led it is reasonable to suggest that the inspection of teacher training will be added to school's Ofsted inspections. Given the views expressed about inspections by the headteachers in this study this may be an unwelcome addition and further serve to prompt headteachers to consider their involvement in teacher training.

The issue of the resources required to enable teacher training was raised, with some of the headteachers perceiving that increased teacher training in schools was linked to government efforts to save money – teacher training on the cheap – rather than a consideration of how best to train teachers fit to practise. It is difficult to escape this conclusion in some ways, particularly if you consider the ideology which prompted the current government policy of more training in schools – that teaching is best learned on the job. This seems to suggest that if you apprentice a trainee to a teacher, or school, they will learn everything they need to become a good teacher. A happy by-product of this, from the government's point of view, is the suggestion that the school needs few additional resources to achieve this because they are the prime resource. The headteachers in this study disagreed. None of the twelve headteachers interviewed believed training in school was sufficient to produce teachers fit to practise and several perceived it was not, and should not, be their sole responsibility to train teachers. They looked to trainee

teachers having much wider experiences, going to other schools, working with training staff not based in schools and having the chance to discuss, debate and reflect on their experiences away from the school.

There are costs associated with these extended opportunities for trainee teachers and these costs do not, at the moment, form part of allocated school budgets.

Those schools who want to take on more responsibility for teacher training will need to be prepared to include financial responsibility in that undertaking but there was a concern expressed by some of the headteachers that this will simply mean them having to stretch their existing budgets to cover the cost of greater involvement. Brooks (2006:391), in her evaluation of early training [teaching] schools, noted effective teacher training in schools needed '...an environment characterised by additional resourcing and financial support' and that '...in cash-strapped ITT, they have emerged only rarely'. On this basis it would appear the headteachers are right to be concerned about the financial and resourcing implications of increased teacher training in schools. There is likely to be resistance from many of the headteachers interviewed if they are required to fund additional aspects of teacher training, particularly in the light of them identifying that they wished to work in partnership with bodies outside the school because, unlike the government, they did not believe the sole responsibility for teacher training should be with schools. They did not consider that they should be placed on their own in the front line of teacher training as this would not produce the teachers they sought to employ in their schools.

Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the findings in terms of the context of teacher training, to include consideration of current reforms to the system. In summary, the discussion noted that the headteachers looked for attributes in teachers fit to practise in primary schools which went well beyond those detailed in the Standards and the Ofsted criteria, particularly in terms of critical thinking skills. Yet some of the headteachers believed they had the ability to spot good teachers early in meeting them, and they extended this to spotting potential in prospective teachers. The headteachers believed that trainee teachers should spend the majority of their training in schools where they could practise being teachers. However they also wanted to work with academic partners who would provide the theoretical training and reflective opportunities needed to allow the trainees to reach their full potential. Academic partners were most frequently described as universities and there was a level of mistrust exhibited by some of the headteachers of the idea that teaching schools could assume this role. When on practice the headteachers believed trainees needed to be placed in good schools where a climate existed that supported their training. The trainees needed to have opportunities to engage in professional dialogue with skilled mentors and expert practitioners. Headteachers perceived senior leaders, most usually themselves, needed to maintain a strategic overview of teacher training in schools. External factors, such as Ofsted inspections and funding, put pressure on schools and the headteachers believed such pressures might cause them to reconsider participation in teacher training.

Chapter Seven: Personal Reflection and Evaluation of the Study

Introduction

This chapter is a personal reflection on the research experience that made use of a reflexive approach. It begins with reflection on the definition of reflexivity utilised here, and continues by considering what I learned from the pilot and how this new learning supported me to refocus the research aims for the main study. My reflection also includes an evaluation of the study to include the identification of both the strengths and the constraints of the study design and the way I carried out the research, and considers alternative approaches that I may have taken and what these may have offered.

Reflexivity

Charmaz (2014) advised that researchers who adopt a constructivist grounded theory approach should ensure that their study includes the opportunity for them to scrutinise their experience, decisions and interpretations by means of reflexivity.

Charmaz (2014:344) defined the process of reflexivity as:

‘...examining how the researcher’s interpretations, positions and assumptions influenced his or her inquiry. A reflexive stance informs how the researcher conducts his or her research, relates to the research participants, and represents them in written report.’

This research study sought to interpret meanings and practices in a specific context (Scott and Usher, 1999). The context was the teacher training of primary school teachers and the experiences and practices were of twelve primary school headteachers. As Shaw (2010) commented, taking a reflexive stance allows the

researcher to position him or herself in the research process. This was an important aspect to my research and one in which I perceive my understanding of the process of reflexivity to have developed during the research study.

Reflections on the pilot

Reflecting on the pilot study I can now see that my reflexive approach was largely focused on practical problem solving where I would look back at the actions I had taken and asked myself how well I did and how I could improve (Bolton, 2010). It was reflective rather than reflexive practice. Once a colleague had identified a potential case study and the school had agreed to participate I assumed, because I had no involvement in the training year for the trainee, that this would ensure unbiased research. What I see now is that I did not consider my position sufficiently well before attempting to enter the world of the participants. One example of this can be seen in my failure to take into account the background context of the school in the pilot study. Had I done this it would have created the opportunity to look in more depth at whether the school had embedded procedures to allow all trainees to attain an outstanding outcome or whether there was a set of factors which allowed the trainee in the research focus to attain an outstanding outcome. In addition I had assumed because the trainee had attained a grade of outstanding that the participants, and the systems used to grade the trainee, all shared an understanding of what outstanding meant. As I also used the grading systems in my professional work I believe I assumed the participants and I shared a similar understanding. The failure to contextualise the pilot study constrained any theorising of the findings.

The data collection and recursive analysis method adopted in the pilot study did support me to develop my understanding of reflexivity. In making repeated visits to the school to interview the three participants it was inevitable that professional relationships would be formed. All three participants were qualified primary school teachers, as I was, and I had held roles of school-based mentor and of headteacher. This was something I had considered in some aspects from the commencement of the research as part of my reflexive approach, as I was researching in a world with which I was very familiar. This may have had benefits in terms of the participants viewing me as someone with a similar professional background to them and as such a legitimate researcher in the topic to whom they were willing to offer their profession understandings. I tried to ensure that I maintained the role of researcher, rather than colleague, in the interviews. I found that the recursive data analysis process, listening to the tapes of the interviews whilst annotating the transcripts, supported this aim. This was because it allowed me to maintain my focus on what it was the participants actually said, decide how this could best be coded and then use this to inform the next set of questions. I perceived that I developed my understanding of the need for a relentless focus on the data to support the trustworthiness of the research.

Refocusing the research aims

The period following the completion of the pilot study saw a number of proposed reforms to teacher training, announced by the Coalition government. As discussed earlier, this contributed to the change of focus for the main study. As the reforms were implemented, the impact on those most closely involved in teacher training

began to unfold. Differing parties put forward their views on the reforms and their predictions of the impact of these reforms. The interviews with the headteachers for the main study took place during this period. It may be that this on-going debate influenced the views of one or more of the headteachers. It may also be that as the reforms were in their early stages of impacting on schools that the headteachers had given them less consideration and expressed their views in terms of the current and previous experiences of teacher training that they had. As this was an interpretivist study exploring the professional experiences of the headteachers it could be argued that doing so in a changing landscape adds to the richness of the data. It must also be acknowledged, however, that as the reforms continue to impact on schools the headteachers may have experiences which will cause them to alter views that they expressed during the research interviews.

Personal experience and credibility as the researcher

It may have been advantageous to me as a researcher to interview headteachers because of my professional background. As a former headteacher I was familiar with the professional role of the participants. This gave me an understanding and appreciation of the participants' roles and may have allowed them to view me as a credible member of their professional community. This may have resulted in them being open and honest in their interviews.

Constraints of research design and implementation

A constraint of the research study is the number of headteachers interviewed for the study. This is a small scale study and, whilst no generalisations were sought through the methodology for the study, it must be acknowledged that only twelve

headteachers were interviewed and therefore all conclusions drawn must be viewed as tentative. It would have been preferable for this number to be higher and a more thorough consideration of the planning stage for the collection of data would have been of benefit to this study as it may have increased the number of interviews undertaken. I can now see that I did not fully consider the timings of interviews within the context of my work commitments and those of the prospective participants. I should have had a broader set of contingency plans and planned further ahead than I actually did. At the time that I was undertaking the planning it appeared that I had given thought to changes in the schedule. It is only when I now really stand back and look, as a reflexive approach advises, I can see my initial planning was insufficiently broad.

Strengths of research design and implementation

Another aspect of the research planning I struggled with was the time I had allocated to data analysis, where I significantly underestimated the time and effort this would require, even though I completed only twelve interviews. However, I believe that the data analysis procedure adopted was one of the strengths of the research study. In following Charmaz's (2006) adaptation of Strauss and Corbin's (1990) approach I had a framework to follow. I found this supported me even though the process was messy, time-consuming and, at times, extremely frustrating. What this framework does is to keep a relentless focus on the data and this supports the researcher to remain focused on what the data shows. This way the researcher makes no assertions unless these can be supported by the data. The recursive nature of the data analysis discourages any early coding of data. Initially I

found this challenging as I wanted to describe things and give names to them so that I could bring some order to the analysis. However, as the process continued, I developed an appreciation of how a relentless and recursive focus on the data allowed meaning to emerge and aided the trustworthiness of the findings. I went from seeking to present what the headteachers said to becoming confident enough to present my interpretation of the meanings of what headteachers said. The following chapter will summarise my interpretations of these meanings.

Conclusion

In this study I have taken the view that knowledge is appropriately seen as constructed and dynamic within the context of changing circumstances and individuals' changing understandings. Through the research process, with its relentless recursive focus on the data and data analysis, I have come to understand that I needed to go beyond a straightforward descriptive approach to presenting findings to having the confidence to interpret and comment on the significance of the views of others. Research methods that would enable collation of data from a broad sample of the population might have generated more data and, thus, might seem to offer the potential for greater validity in my interpretation and conclusions. However methods, such as the use of questionnaires, also might restrict the depth and richness of data that would support the focus and intentions of this research study.

Chapter Eight: Conclusion

Introduction

This chapter first focuses on the potential for contribution to knowledge of the current study in two particular areas:

- the foregrounding of the voices of those senior staff in schools who are, or will be most closely involved in implementing government reforms in education, but whose voices appear to be largely unheard as yet, and
- the importance of the findings for supporting future generations of teachers in training

This is followed by a summary of the findings against each of the research objectives. The chapter concludes with recommendations both for the process of teacher training, including contexts where headteachers take on increased responsibility, and also for future research.

Contribution to knowledge

There are a number of areas in which the current research study can be seen as making a contribution to knowledge, two in particular. The first, and most significant, is that I have foregrounded the, as yet largely unheard, voices of senior experienced staff in primary schools who will be the personnel most closely involved in, and accountable for, the outcome of current government reforms that encourage schools to take the lead in teacher training. As noted in the literature review, in the view of the Prime Minister, David Cameron, schools should be in the 'front line' for providing, and being accountable for, the quality of teacher training.

The second contribution lies in the very clear implications of what will need to be in place to enable future generations of very good practitioners of the sort that the headteachers, that is those professionals who are in a well- informed position to make the judgment, would seek to employ in their schools. The outcomes of the headteachers' interviews not only raise a number of important issues that do not seem to have been apparent before, but also call into question the viability of government reforms that rely on headteachers' willingness and preparedness to implement them. If schools are in the 'front line' of policy implementation, then it seems pragmatically sensible to pay attention to the views and experiences of their lead practitioners, that is, the headteachers

Focus on voices of those with experience

The most recent, and the current, governments have pursued a policy which seeks to place schools in the front line of teacher training. The rationale for this is largely presented in terms of an argument that teaching is a craft and therefore best learnt through a model which demonstrates primacy of practice. This model takes the responsibility for teacher training away from HEIs and passes it over to schools. At the forefront of this move is a policy to establish a number of teaching schools which are charged with forming alliances to lead other schools in the promotion of this model of training. Schools must hold Ofsted grades of 'outstanding' to be considered for designation as teaching schools. It might be argued that these are thus schools doing exactly what the government wants schools to do. What appears to be missing from the debate are the voices of headteachers from a wider group of schools – of the leaders who are expected to implement the policy changes. There

is literature considering the impact these reforms will have on HEIs (Childs, 2013; Browne and Reid, 2012), but there appears to be less written about what these reforms might look like in primary schools from the points of view of those leading the schools.

Issues related to supporting future trainee teachers

This constructivist research study sought to explore the views of headteachers leading primary schools to identify their perceptions of the role of schools in the training teachers. The findings brought forward a number of issues which may not have been so apparent in previous research, such as:

- The headteachers, whilst considering practice to be the most important element of teacher training, did not believe it was the sole element to training teachers fit to teach primary age children
- The headteachers perceived trainees required theoretical training in order to develop their understanding of practice. Trainees needed time away from the school to discuss and reflect on practice.
- This theoretical training needed to be located outside of the school and led by academics who were experts in theoretical aspects of teaching.
- The relationship between the school and the academics needed to be an equal partnership where each were considered the experts in their field.
- There was concern from some headteachers that working with a teaching school as the leader of a teacher training alliance would result in them ceding control of their school to the teaching school.

- The headteachers were concerned with the financial burden of assuming greater responsibility for teacher training, to include concerns that the government was seeking to train teachers 'on the cheap'.
- The headteachers believed they, as leaders of their school, had the option to not participate in teacher training, particularly if they believed their school needed to focus inward at any point, and specifically to prepare for an Ofsted inspection
- If a school was to participate in teacher training, it needed to have a climate which promoted learning through professional dialogue, where trainees would be guided by expert practitioners. There was less consideration of any training these practitioners might need to support trainees
- The headteachers perceived it was their responsibility to take the strategic lead in establishing this climate but there was little consideration of the distribution of this leadership to develop middle leaders.
- The headteachers appeared compliant in their acceptance of the use of the Teachers' Standards (DfE, 2011b) and Ofsted criteria to judge and grade trainees' performance, despite their criteria for teachers fit to practise appearing far wider and deeper than these two measures.
- The headteachers were keen to see a range of routes into teaching to maximise the pool from which teachers might be drawn and they suggested that different routes would suit different applicants. There were concerns of an imminent teacher shortage.

- The 'grow-your-own-teacher' School Direct Salaried (SDS) route was popular with the headteachers who perceived they felt more responsibility for, and control over, the trainees' training.

The findings from this small-scale study suggested that these primary headteachers, whilst they found some aspects of the government's reforms attractive, did not share the central tenet that learning to become a teacher fit to practise was fully achievable through an apprenticeship model.

Achievement of Objectives

The first part of the first research objective and the second research objective were concerned with the headteachers' perceptions of how they identified teachers fit to teach primary age children and how these identifications compared with the Teachers' Standards (DfE, 2011b) and the Ofsted grading criteria (2009). Initially the respondents were asked about the attributes of outstanding teachers and their responses were probed further to establish their views on the teachers they perceived to be fit to teach in their schools. The respondents chose to respond by using terms such as 'outstanding', 'good' and 'best' to describe these teachers. This widening of vocabulary was seen in the descriptors the headteachers gave of their best teachers, which went far beyond those given in the Standards or the Ofsted criteria. The headteachers believed that the best teachers were able to think critically and independently. Doing this would allow them to make wise judgements on actions to take in the complex undertaking of teaching (Hay-McBer, 2000; Kennedy, 2006; and Sockett, 2009). These were the teachers one respondent described as those able to bring him solutions rather than problems.

Despite their descriptions of the attributes of their best teachers being far wider than the systems in use to judge teaching, there was evidence that the headteachers were content to comply with these systems. This was linked to their compliance to the accountability measures, such as Ofsted inspections, which are placed on schools. They had no control over these measures therefore they would accept them. The headteachers used these systems as benchmarks of trainees' progress, attainment and achievement. But what the respondents did was to bring their own beliefs into selecting trainees when they had a choice. They did this because they perceived their professional experience allowed them to identify the right person for their school.

In exploring the third research objective this perception became apparent and it has implications for the greater involvement of schools in teacher training.

Headteachers who believe they can spot potential in entrants to teaching, and who use this to appoint trainees to their schools, may contribute to an inequality of opportunity for prospective teachers. Schools could find themselves in danger of breaching equality legislation. In addition, issues of situated learning will arise whereby teachers could be selected and trained to work in particular schools and thus be required to follow the institutional practices of that school. This is likely, in some schools at least, to lead to stagnation and a lack of new ideas coming into the school. Where new teachers are perceived to fail to meet the desired practices this will impact on the teacher's perception of their identity as a teacher and on the school staff involved in the training. In the average size primary school this is likely

to impact on a significant percentage of staff members and on the relationships within the school.

Schools, and headteachers, who chose to take on the responsibility for selecting prospective teachers to train, will need to consider carefully the criteria they will use and the systems they put in place. An important question for them to consider is whether they perceive they are selecting a trainee to be trained as a teacher for their school or as a teacher for the teaching profession. If there is a teacher shortage, as some commentators have suggested, it may be tempting for headteachers seeking to protect their schools to participate in teacher training as a means to ensure their schools are staffed. A changing national policy which links the training of teachers to the recruitment of teachers moves these responsibilities deftly over to schools.

The fourth research objective, which also linked to the second part of the first objective, explored the headteachers' perceptions of routes into primary teaching and how these routes should contribute to the production of the teachers they sought to employ in their schools. The findings demonstrated that routes which allowed schools to 'grow their own' teachers were popular with the respondents and thus a national policy linking training and recruitment might prove attractive to primary school headteachers. However, one of the main reasons the respondents were keen on this type of route was that they perceived it gave them the most control over the choice of trainee and the training programme. Control was important to the headteachers and this was demonstrated in their concerns about working with teaching schools, even though such schools support a 'grow your own'

approach. Working with teaching schools meant ceding control to them according to the respondents. The headteacher who leads a teaching school denied this was true but acknowledged the concerns of his peers and identified that government policy had branded such schools as elitist. If teacher training is to be led by schools, and in particular by teaching schools, then a way to overcome other headteachers distrust will need to be found. If not, this threatens to weaken the government reforms as teaching schools are reliant on other schools joining them in some form of alliance but the headteachers in this study showed little willingness to consider such a move.

There were tensions in the respondents' views on routes into teaching as they valued trainee teachers having the time to practise teaching and to study teaching but selected preferred routes which placed the practice of teaching at the forefront. It may be that the desire of some of the respondents to see the continuation of a variety of routes into primary teaching goes some way to address this concern. These headteachers wanted to see the variety of routes into teaching maintained and did not support a 'one-size-fits-all' approach. They were concerned with the supply of teachers and wanted routes into teaching to be accessible to as wide a group of potential teachers as possible.

The fifth research objective focused on the respondents' perceptions of what was required in schools to support successful teacher training and produce teachers fit to teach primary age children. It was here that the respondents most forcefully made their case for the primacy of practice in learning to be a teacher. To them it was essential that trainee teachers had opportunities to see what teaching was

really like and to practise teaching. To do this trainees needed to be in schools where good practice was taking place and Ofsted inspection grades were seen as identifying such schools. As headteachers they had the responsibilities for creating a climate which valued teacher training, identifying expert practitioners to support trainees and monitoring the overall training programme in school. The headteachers articulated in detail the role the school could play in teacher training and demonstrated a commitment to training teachers. They were less forthcoming in any consideration of additional training and resourcing which might be needed to enable the practitioners to fully support trainees (Carter Review, 2015). In a school-led training system, particularly in primary schools, this may lead to circumstances where practitioners supporting trainee teachers work in isolation in their own school and get little or no chance to develop their skills in mentoring working with mentors and staff outside of their school. It also calls into question the issue of teacher workload, a current government concern, where supporting teacher training in school is simply added to primary school teachers' existing classroom and leadership responsibilities.

The headteachers went some way to address this type of concern with their assertions, linked to the sixth research objective, that it was not in a school's remit to take sole responsibility for teacher training. Although they perceived practice was an essential element of teacher training, and that this was undertaken in schools, they did not believe it to be the only element required for successful training. In training the respondents wanted prospective teachers to research and study the theory of teaching to develop their understanding of the practice they

experienced and practised in school. The headteachers perceived trainees needed time to assimilate this and that this was best undertaken away from practice, away from the school. This contradicts the views of Gove (2012), Wilshaw (2012) and Taylor (2014) that trainees can learn all they need to in schools - that all they require is practical training. The headteachers believed trainee teachers needed both practical training and theoretical training to enter the profession of teaching. And perhaps here is one of the more subtle differences – the government appears to view teaching as a craft, a trade to be learned ‘on-the-job’, and this, on the surface, may appeal to headteachers who perceived that school practice is not, or has not in the past been, seen as an equal of theoretical training, particularly by HEIs. It was important to the headteachers in this study that the time trainees spent in school was seen as crucial to their training. But when the headteachers were given the opportunity to reflect on their views and experiences they identified that the best practitioners had a range of attributes and dispositions and that theoretical training, as well as practical training, was required to develop these. This theoretical training included the study of teaching, of pedagogy and the time for trainees to reflect and to engage in critical thinking. Whilst it was evident that the headteachers valued these elements of teacher training it is acknowledged that they were less confident in identifying the elements which constituted such study. The respondents perceived they were in the domain of experts in practice and that there were others, outside of the school and particularly in higher education, who were the experts in theory. The headteachers believed trainee teachers required exposure to both sets of experts.

With one exception, the headteachers in this study believed their school staff would not have the capacity to meet all the needs of trainees and that thus schools would require partners with whom to work. The nature of the partnership between the schools and those they would select as their academic partners again reflected subtle difference between government views and those of the headteachers. A cornerstone of one of the arguments put forward by Gove and Wilshaw for greater control of teacher training by schools was that headteachers were constantly assailing them with concerns about how ill-prepared to teach were the trainees coming from HEIs. There were some echoes of this with the headteachers with comments about trainees from the PGCE route in particular having to ‘...catch up because they haven’t covered enough’ and the comments from the government representatives may well have been made to heighten such concerns amongst headteachers. But again, when the headteachers had the opportunity to reflect on their views they believed that they sought an equal partnership where the contribution of their school was considered as valuable as the contribution of the academic partner.

The view that schools should not take sole responsibility for teacher training comprised a range of concerns. One of these was that the prime job of a school was to educate the pupils in its care – and that this therefore meant schools could not fully take responsibility for the education of trainee teachers, linking to concerns expressed in the study of teacher training partnerships by Brisard, Menter and Smith (2000). There appears to be an assumption from the government that teaching pupils and training teachers requires the same environment and

resources, to include staff, but the headteachers did not share this assumption.

They were concerned that, at a time of government austerity measures, this was a move to a cheaper form of teacher training. The headteachers in this study had a keen eye on their budgets and were concerned about further demands being made on schools' financial capacities.

The final research objective explored the participants' perceptions of factors which might limit or deter their participation in teacher training. The headteachers perceived they held the right not to participate in training if they judged it to not be of benefit to their school at any particular time. This may be of concern to a government who will need schools to train teachers because that is where they have moved the training places. The government is dependent on headteachers' willingness to participate each academic year to ensure the supply of teachers. Yet it was government policies on the public accountability of schools, most particular in the form of Ofsted inspections, which impacted on the headteachers' decisions and which may deter them from regular participation in teacher training.

The headteachers' complex relationships with Ofsted were apparent in the findings. They made regular use of the language of Ofsted, appeared to comply with Ofsted grading criteria and to accept grading judgements made by Ofsted on schools as indicators of ability to participate in teacher training. Yet they perceived Ofsted as having a negative impact on them, on their school and on the profession of teaching. The headteachers appeared to exercise pragmatic judgement in their dealing with Ofsted – they accepted things they felt they had little option but to accept, or where it suited them (such as the use of the Ofsted criteria to make

judgements on teaching) but when they perceived there was the opportunity for them to exercise control they took it. The government may find that putting schools in the front line of teacher training may give headteachers choices which do not coincide with government plans. It is interesting to speculate whether the very recent conciliatory messages coming from Ofsted about working in professional partnerships with schools might be linked to the government wishing to address the sorts of concerns expressed by these headteachers (Harford, 2015; Wilshaw: 2015).

The headteachers also expressed concerns about the cost to schools of greater participation in teacher training and perceived that changes to policy may result in school budgets coming under increasing pressure. It is unlikely schools would be willing, or believe themselves able, to take on the financial costs themselves in order to fulfil the government's policy. If the headteachers retain the autonomy to decide on whether to participate in teacher training, the government may find itself considering measures to persuade them to do so. Or perhaps the government will need to consider measures which make participation in teacher training a requirement of most schools in order to support their policy of front line responsibility for teacher training resting with schools.

Recommendations

Within the analysis of the data for this small-scale research study a number of issues were identified from the narratives of the headteachers. There were links between these issues and the impact of the government reforms in a changing

landscape of teacher training. Recommendations are now made to reflect these links.

The first recommendation is that schools and HEIs seize the opportunity to recast the partnership between them as envisaged by Hodson, Smith and Brown (2012). It may be that this can best be achieved in small local partnerships where schools and HEIs are prepared to enter into honest and open discussions on how to train teachers and devise programmes that met these training needs rather than the needs of one or both partners. Both partners will need to be willing to acknowledge and utilise the expertise of the other and doing this could lead to collaborative working practices which benefit both partners and the trainees. This will be a challenge in the current climate and will require bold leadership from both partners.

The second recommendation is concerned with teaching schools. They currently exist and they are supported by the government. It may be of benefit for leaders of teaching schools to grasp the mettle of other headteachers' wariness and enter into discussions about the type of teacher training alliances that might tempt local schools to work collaboratively. Again the need for open and honest discussions focused on views about how best to train teachers will be required and those leading teaching schools will need to be receptive to the views of other headteachers. An emerging teacher training alliance led by a teaching school would make an interesting case study research project and this might be something the alliance considers to support its sustainability.

The third recommendation is that headteachers in their own schools review their provision for teacher training in the school. The preparation and training of school-based mentors should go beyond that of dealing with systems and paperwork to ensure school-based mentors are confident to challenge trainee teachers to become teachers fit to practise through detailed feedback and professional dialogue (Carter Review, 2015). Headteachers should ensure that all appropriate members of staff are engaged with the teacher training practices of the school so that they can support trainees. In addition the headteachers may wish to consider that assuming some strategic responsibility for teacher training in the school could provide professional development for middle leaders (Crow, 2007; Bush, 2013). This could have the added bonus of reducing the headteachers' day-to-day responsibilities and allow them to take a greater strategic view of teacher training provision in their schools.

The fourth recommendation is that the headteachers may wish to reflect on the strategies they employ to select trainee teachers, particularly on the SDS route, to consider whether they are over reliant on their personal beliefs in terms of *fit*. It may benefit the headteachers to consider the in more detail the attributes and dispositions they believe identify teachers fit to practise in their schools and make more explicit use of such a set of criteria to guide their decision making. Any headteacher who assumes greater responsibility for interviewing potential teachers in a partnership or alliance may wish to consider guidance from literature on training to develop strategies to address 'the interview illusion' (Cable and Judge, 1997).

The final recommendation concerns future research. With the substantial reforms that have been made to teacher training, research into the impact of these reforms would appear to be in need and should be a consideration of the government. It would seem an obvious focus for the National College of Teaching and Leadership (NCTL) as well as for independent academic researchers. In terms of this research study exploring the views of a wider group of primary headteachers would allow the opportunity to investigate whether issues raised by the headteachers in this study were common to other headteachers. In addition, although the government denies it to be the case, there appears to be a rising concern about teacher supply (DfE, 2015: Online; Stewart, 2015). It may benefit to undertake research to investigate whether reforms to teacher training have impacted on the supply of teachers in order to take any remedial actions.

Final summary and conclusion

This research study, although small in scale and with an amended focus, has nonetheless succeeded in exploring primary school headteachers' perceptions of the role of school in teacher training to include consideration of how best primary school teachers' fitness to practise might be developed. This, according to the headteachers, required trainees to undertake practical and theoretical training, with practice located in school and theory located with an academic partner working in partnership with the school. Thus these headteachers rejected current government policy which suggests an apprenticeship model is the most effective method of teacher training and is the method schools and headteachers have asked to have. These headteachers wanted to see multiple routes into teaching to attract

a wide range of potential teachers and to ensure they had access to a choice of routes to select the route most suited to them. The responses of the headteachers interviewed for this study call into question the policy of the government in seeking to narrow teacher training to school-based routes.

Appendices

Appendix A: Ofsted Grading Criteria for Trainee Teachers, 2008-11

Ofsted (2009) *Grade Criteria for the Inspection of Initial Teacher Training 2008-11*.

Manchester: Ofsted

Annex 1. Grading trainees' attainments

Attainment is defined as how well trainees:

- ④ meet the QTS Standards, or
- ④ meet the assessment requirements of the relevant qualification to teach in the lifelong learning sector (for the FE system).

Judgements of trainees' attainment take no account of trainees' starting points or the context of the training. Factors such as these are accounted for elsewhere in the grade profile and key inspection questions. **Using the criteria to grade individual trainees**

During inspections, inspectors will always meet with individual and/or groups of trainees and scrutinise their files (teaching files, records of evidence, records of feedback etc). On some inspections they will also observe the teaching of a sample of trainees. These grade descriptions for trainees' attainment have been grouped to enable judgements to be matched to these inspection activities.

Grouping characteristics	Inspection activity
Trainees' teaching: What might you see in a lesson/teaching session?	Observation of teaching
Trainees' files: What might you see in their files?	Sample of trainees' files Meetings with individuals or groups Interviews with trainees whose teaching has been observed
Trainees' explanations: What sort of things can they explain?	Meetings with individuals or groups Interviews with trainees whose teaching has been observed
Trainees' characteristics: What noticeable characteristics do they have?	All of the above

These criteria indicate the quality of teachers in training, not those of qualified practitioners. This is relevant to those trainees in the FE system who have teaching experience before commencing their training. Many of the characteristics are indicators of the potential of trainees to become good or better teachers. A particular case is the quality of trainees' lessons. For example, we should not expect outstanding trainees to always teach outstanding lessons (as judged using the criteria for school or college inspections), although the very large majority of their lessons should be at least good. We should look for the potential to be outstanding teachers, which includes learning from situations where lessons do not go as planned, including learning from mistakes.

Lesson observations will result in judgements of the quality of the lesson based on the grade criteria for lessons used during school or college inspections. These are

'absolute' judgements. However, it is recognised that many observations by trainers of trainees' lessons are developmental rather than 'absolute'. The assessment of the lesson needs to be considered alongside other evidence to judge the progress made by the trainee.

Reaching the judgement:

- ④ Those making judgements need to check that the satisfactory 'criteria' have been met before using the 'good' or 'outstanding' characteristics to make a judgement at a higher level.
- ④ To be judged **satisfactory, all aspects of satisfactory** in each of the four groups have to be achieved:
 - for a trainee following a course leading to **QTS** they must meet all of the QTS Standards
 - for trainees in the **FE system**, they must meet all of the requirements of the appropriate teaching qualification for the FE system
- ④ In order to judge a trainee as good or outstanding, those making the judgement need to look at the characteristics in all four sections. The characteristics are intended to describe the features that indicate that a trainee is performing at that level. It is a 'best fit' model. They also need to be interpreted within the setting and context in which the trainees work.
- ④ In making the final decision, inspectors need to weigh the evidence in each of the sections. To be outstanding overall there has to be sufficient **outstanding features in all four areas**. Similarly, in reaching a judgement of **good** there has to be sufficient **good features in all four areas**.

Trainees' attainment judged to be inadequate:

Any trainee's attainment will be deemed to be inadequate (grade 4) if they do not by the end of the course (unless they have been granted an extension or deferral):

- ④ meet all of the QTS Standards or the requirements of the appropriate teaching qualification for the FE system
- and/or
- ④ meet all of the criteria for 'satisfactory' in each of the sections outlined below for grading trainees' attainment.

Features of trainees

Grade	Key aspects of trainees' performance: In lessons
Outstanding	<p>Outstanding trainees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ④ teach lessons that are mostly good, and often show characteristics of outstanding lessons ④ ensure that all learners make progress so that they fully achieve the challenging intended learning outcomes ④ teach learners to be able to explain how the teaching helped them to make progress ④ teach lessons that invariably capture the interest of learners, are inclusive of all learners, and feature debate between learners and between learners and the teacher ④ have a rapport with learners – high-quality dialogue and questioning, guiding learning, with attention to individuals and groups ④ monitor learners' progress to evaluate quickly how well they are learning so that they can change the approach during the lesson if necessary, and provide detailed feedback and targets to individual learners that are focused well to ensure further progress ④ demonstrate the ability to apply their own depth of subject knowledge to support learners in acquiring understanding and skills, often showing understanding, through application of a range of different approaches to ensure that all learners make the expected progress ④ demonstrate flexibility and adaptability by changing pace, approach and teaching method in a lesson in response to what learners say and do ④ make links with other aspects of learners' development and understanding (for example, linking to work in other subjects) ④ fully exploit possibilities to promote learners' understanding and appreciation of social and cultural diversity.
Good	<p>Good trainees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ④ teach lessons that are never less than satisfactory, but often good or better ④ ensure that all learners are sufficiently challenged and achieve the intended learning objectives ④ teach in a way that engages learners' interest so that they

	<p>become fully involved in the lesson</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ④ make creative use of resources ④ use a range of different assessment methods matched well to the expected learning outcomes and show an understanding of why a particular method was chosen ④ monitor and assess learners' achievement and provide feedback to them that is based on the specific needs of learners or groups of learners that leads to further progress ④ show flexibility/adaptability that takes account of the progress made by learners and match their teaching to it, including by matching pace to learning and the use of a variety of teaching methods ④ understand how to overcome barriers to learning such as low levels of literacy/numeracy ④ use their subject knowledge to find different ways of explaining or teaching approaches ④ work effectively with learning support and other professionals in planning, teaching and monitoring and reviewing learners' progress ④ make links with and explore possibilities to develop learners' understanding and appreciation of social and cultural diversity.
--	---

Satisfactory	<p>To be judged satisfactory a trainee must meet all of the QTS Standards or the requirements of the appropriate learning and skills teaching qualification by the end of the course.</p> <p>Satisfactory trainees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ④ teach consistently at least satisfactory lessons (by the end of their training) in which learners make progress or consolidate their learning¹ ④ teach at a satisfactory level across a range of different contexts (for example, different ages, groups sizes, levels) ④ respond to individual and groups of learners' questions and needs to enable learners to progress and meet the learning expectations ④ demonstrate secure subject knowledge that develops learners' understanding and skills ④ set clear expectations for learning and behaviour ④ manage the learning environment and resources to enable all learners to make progress ④ match teaching and learning activities to the intended learning outcomes ④ plan and use resources efficiently, including the deployment of other adults, learning support and other professionals ④ monitor learners' progress and assess their achievement, and provide feedback to learners which aids their progress ④ begin to develop learners' wider understanding and appreciation of social and cultural diversity.
Inadequate	See page 28.

Grade	Key aspects of trainees' performance: Trainees' files
Outstanding	<p>Outstanding trainees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ④ demonstrate a clear and deep understanding of how to plan for progression – stages in learning, different rates of progress, identifying clear 'strands of progression' and the use of these to plan 'steps in learning', their teaching, dealing with barriers to learning, and through this demonstrate depth of subject knowledge and subject pedagogy ④ provide evidence of monitoring and recording learners' progress and how this the outcomes are used in subsequent planning, with a clear focus on groups and individual learners ④ demonstrate the clarity of links between learning objectives, teaching approaches and assessment strategies – 'what I want learners to learn, how they will learn, and how I know that they have, what I will do next' ④ show innovation within the constraints of a scheme of work/curriculum ④ maintain files as working documents – annotated as part of selfevaluation ④ show high-quality self-evaluation with clear focus on learners and setting challenging targets for their own professional development – including, for example, future career progression with evidence of implementation and further review, and critical analysis and reflection, taking full account of feedback from trainers and other professionals they work with ④ innovative approaches to the integration of Every Child Matters, and social and cultural diversity.
Good	<p>Good trainees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ④ plan lessons that take account of the needs of groups of learners and individuals, through the setting of differentiated learning outcomes, and matching these to the teaching and learning approaches and activities used – with clear recognition of how to deal with any potential barriers to learning – and through this demonstrate their own depth of subject knowledge ④ plan clear links between expected outcomes and how progress and achievement will be monitored and assessed, with outcomes used in subsequent planning ④ set lessons clearly in a sequence that is designed well to secure progression

	<p>④ provide clear evidence of understanding the need to take responsibility for their own professional development through evaluating performance and setting challenging targets, working with trainers to refine these and to monitor their progress, then evidence of implementation, review and critical reflection.</p>
Satisfactory	<p>To be judged satisfactory a trainee must meet all of the QTS Standards or the requirements of the appropriate learning and skills teaching qualification by the end of the course.</p> <p>Satisfactory trainees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ④ plan lesson/s that set clear learning outcomes and indicate how the planned activities will enable learners to meet these, and how progress and achievement will be monitored and assessed – including recognition of potential barriers to learning such as low levels of literacy/numeracy ④ evaluate their teaching and show an understanding of the need to evaluate the effectiveness of it through the impact on learners – with evidence of the use of aspects covered in training activities to secure trainees’ own progress ④ take some responsibility for their own professional development – clear relationship between targets set by trainers and trainees’ own reflections and personal target-setting, and trainees’ progress ④ take account of Every Child Matters, and social and cultural diversity.
Inadequate	See page 28.

Grade	Key aspects of trainees' performance: Trainees' explanations
Outstanding	<p>Outstanding trainees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ④ describe the stages in progress through a topic/set of ideas and concepts/sequence of teaching – explaining what they would look for in learners ④ can give examples of lessons, and individual/groups of learners, to illustrate this – including the identification of barriers to learning and how these were/can be overcome ④ are able to discuss in detail individual learners' progress as well as attainment/achievement ④ are able to use their depth of subject-specific pedagogical understanding to explain in detail why they use particular teaching approaches and why these are likely to be more successful than others ④ demonstrate an understanding of the range of professionals that contribute to learners' overall development and their place in the 'bigger picture' – well-informed discussion about individual/groups of learners and particular needs ④ show a depth of understanding of the implications of Every Child Matters across a wide range of work and how to promote learners' understanding and exploit the potential provided by social and cultural diversity.

Good	<p>Good trainees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ④ can give examples of how they have secured progression for groups of learners through a sequence of lessons, including how they know that learners have made progress ④ are able to explain why they use particular teaching and learning approaches and why these work in their subject ④ demonstrate their understanding of barriers to learning and how these can be overcome in their subject ④ can give examples of working with a wider range of professionals to secure the overall development of learners ④ demonstrate a secure understanding of the implications of Every Child Matters, and social and cultural diversity, and can apply this to their own teaching.
Satisfactory	<p>To be judged satisfactory a trainee must meet all of the QTS Standards or the requirements of the appropriate learning and skills teaching qualification by the end of the course.</p> <p>Satisfactory trainees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ④ can explain how the training has enabled them to improve their teaching ④ can explain how their lesson planning fits into a sequence that will enable learners to make progress ④ can explain how they monitor and assess learners' achievements, and how this indicates that they are making progress ④ show awareness of barriers to learning, such as levels of literacy or numeracy, and the likely impact on their subject, with some ideas for dealing with this ④ know who they should turn to for expert advice on particular aspects of learners' overall development, specifically including child protection and safeguarding issues ④ demonstrate a secure understanding of Every Child Matters and of social and cultural diversity.
Inadequate	See page 28.

Grade	Key aspects of trainees' performance: Noticeable characteristics
Outstanding	<p>Outstanding trainees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ④ take risks when trying to make teaching interesting, are able to deal with the unexpected and 'grab the moment' ④ inspire and communicate their enthusiasm to learners ④ have an intrinsic passion for learning ④ show innovative and creative thinking – lateral thinkers ④ have the ability to reflect critically and rigorously on their own practice to inform their professional development, and to take and evaluate appropriate actions – they are able to learn from their mistakes ④ take full responsibility for their own professional development ④ are highly respected by learners and colleagues and, where appropriate, parents/carers and employers ④ have the clear capacity to become outstanding teachers ④ demonstrate, or show the capacity to develop, leadership and management skills.
Good	<p>Good trainees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ④ show a willingness to try out range of approaches to teaching and learning, know how to learn from both success and 'failure', and know when/who to ask for support both in trying out new approaches and in evaluating how well they work ④ clearly understand their own role as 'learners' and how to ensure they achieve their own learning goals ④ systematically evaluate their own practice, including through its impact on learners, and take appropriate action ④ have the clear capacity to become good, and possibly outstanding, teachers.
Satisfactory	<p>To be judged satisfactory a trainee must meet all of the QTS Standards or the requirements of the appropriate learning and skills teaching qualification by the end of the course.</p> <p>Satisfactory trainees:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ④ tend to have a limited, but adequate, range of teaching and assessment strategies, but use these competently and with

	<p>confidence</p> <p>④ evaluate their own practice, including through its impact on learners, and take appropriate action</p> <p>④ recognise that they need help with some aspects of teaching, and are willing to seek out and act on advice and guidance</p> <p>④ show clear capacity to become competent, and in some aspects, good teachers.</p>
Inadequate	See page 28.

Appendix B: Interview Questions for Pilot study

Question for Interview 1

What makes a good teacher?

Questions for Interview 2

What does this look like? (Taking the themes emergent from interview 1)

Questions for Interview 3

The Ofsted Criteria are the means by which trainee teachers are given a summative training judgement.

What is it that the school did to allow the GT to attain an outstanding grade?

What was the most important thing you did in this process?

What do you perceive to be the role of the HT/SBT/GT? (i.e. not their role)

What do you believe most helped the GT to gain outstanding?

Looking at the criteria:

Is the same language you use in school when assessing trainee performance?

Do you have to interpret it for trainees? How do you do this? (For HT and SBT)

What helped you to know what these statements looked like in practice? (NQT)

Looking at both the Standards and the Criteria

Which do you feel most supported the GT in becoming a good teacher?

Appendix C: Ethical Approval

UNIVERSITY OF BEDFORDSHIRE

Research Ethics Scrutiny (Annex to RS1 form)

SECTION A To be completed by the candidate

Registration No: 0614322

Candidate: Elaine Barron

Degree of: EdD

Research Institute: University of Bedfordshire

Research Topic: Teacher Training

External Funding: none

The candidate is required to summarise in the box below the ethical issues involved in the research proposal and how they will be addressed. In any proposal involving human participants the following should be provided:

- clear explanation of how informed consent will be obtained,
- how will confidentiality and anonymity be observed,
- how will the nature of the research, its purpose and the means of dissemination of the outcomes be communicated to participants,
- how personal data will be stored and secured
- if participants are being placed under any form of stress (physical or mental) identify what steps are being taken to minimise risk

If protocols are being used that have already received University Research Ethics Committee (UREC) ethical approval then please specify. Roles of any collaborating institutions should be clearly identified. Reference should be made to the appropriate professional body code of practice.

Change to Focus from Pilot Study

The pilot study for this research took place in the academic year 2011/12 and in exploring the topic of how best a school community could support a trainee teacher, via a case study approach, the study used the Professional Standards for Teachers (2007) and the Ofsted Grading Criteria for Trainee Teachers (2009). These were the current systems at the time of the study. Subsequently both of these have been replaced and these former as well as the new systems will be considered in the research as part of external benchmarks used in ITT. Government policy on ITT has changed with more a move to a greater role for schools in teacher training as articulated in Training the Next Generation of Outstanding Teachers. In discussion with my supervisor it was agreed that the main study could move away from a case study approach to an interpretative study, using grounded theory, of the perceptions of primary school Headteachers of the challenges and opportunities of in school ITT. The purpose is to capture the voice of these Headteachers as they reflect their experiences of ITT against changing national policy and there will be no comparison of provision amongst the schools.. Twenty Headteachers will be sought for initial interviews (January – May 2014). The criteria applied to selection will be at least three years' experience as a Headteacher, experience of more than one route into ITT (i.e RTP, GTP, PGCE, BEd) and that the school currently holds either an Outstanding or Good Ofsted grade so that they can participate in all forms of current ITT routes. Following an initial analysis of the data collected key themes will be identified and six of the initial participants will be invited to participate in another interview to consider these themes in greater depth (June/July 2014).

Twenty primary school Headteachers who have experience of teacher training in their school will be approached informally in the first instance, the purpose of the research will be discussed and they will be asked if they would consider taking part in the research by means of participating in an interview. The Headteachers are known to the researcher in a professional capacity through her work supporting trainee teachers in schools. The researcher will not chose any Headteacher whose school she is working with in this academic year. No inducement to take part will be offered. If they consent to consider participation each Headteacher will be sent the attached participant information sheet and given time to read and consider the information. A follow up e-mail will be sent, all questions will be answered and if they agree to participate a convenient time for the interview will be confirmed. I will visit the school to conduct the interview so as to minimise the time required from the Headteacher. Participants will be informed that they may change their mind at any point and withdraw from the study and they do not have to provide a reason. Doing so will have no impact on the professional relationship between the researcher and the Headteacher. An identical approach will be adopted for the six follow-up interviews.

Participants will be informed that neither they nor their school will be identified in the research. Headteachers will be asked for their permission to record the interview using a voice recorder. Notes will be taken by the researcher to include numerical data on length of time as a Headteacher and in involvement with ITT. The participants own route into teaching will be recorded, as will the grade the school currently holds with Ofsted. This will be translated to an over-sheet which indicates number of the interview in the schedule (1 to 20) and the data collected here, neither the Headteacher's nor the school's name will appear on this sheet, along with any general notes made by the researcher on the themes discussed and with no identifying features recorded. Once completed the contemporaneous notes will be shredded. On return to the university I will transfer the recording to my desk computer saving it on the computer hard drive and the shared drive. The recording on the voice recorder will be deleted. My desk computer is password protected.

Interviews will be sent to an outside source for transcription (Diva Transcriptions who work with many universities). Thus only the researcher and the transcribers will have access to the recording. Returned transcripts will be stored on the university computer as before. If any transcript contains detail which could be used to identify participants or schools this information will be redacted from the transcript and only the redacted transcripts will be saved. Once each transcript is completed the voice recording will be deleted. The redacted transcripts may be viewed by the researcher's supervisors and will form appendices in the final report.

Drafts of the report will be seen by both supervisors. The final report will be publicly available. Participants are informed of this on the attached sheet.

Answer the following question by deleting as appropriate:

1. Does the study involve vulnerable participants or those unable to give informed consent (e.g. children, people with learning disabilities, your own students)?

No

If **YES**: Have/will Researchers be CRB checked?

Yes No

2. Will the study require permission of a gatekeeper for access to participants (e.g. schools, self-help groups, residential homes)?

No

3. Will it be necessary for participants to be involved without consent (e.g. covert observation in non-public places)?

No

4. Will the study involve sensitive topics (e.g. sexual activity, substance abuse)?

No

5. Will blood or tissue samples be taken from participants?

No

6. Will the research involve intrusive interventions (e.g. drugs, hypnosis, physical exercise)?

No

7. Will financial or other inducements be offered to participants (except reasonable expenses)?

No

8. Will the research investigate any aspect of illegal activity?

No

9. Will participants be stressed beyond what is normal for them?

No

10. Will the study involve participants from the NHS (e.g. patients) or participants who fall under the requirements of the Mental Capacity Act 2005?

No

If you have answered yes to any of the above questions or if you consider that there are other significant ethical issues then details should be included in your summary above. If you have answered yes to Question 1 then a clear justification for the importance of the research must be provided.

*Please note if the answer to Question 10 is yes then the proposal should be submitted through **NHS research ethics approval procedures** to the appropriate **NRES**. The UREC should be informed of the outcome.

Checklist of documents which should be included:

Project proposal (with details of methodology) & source of funding	
Documentation seeking informed consent (if appropriate)	
Information sheet for participants (if appropriate)	
Questionnaire (if appropriate)	

(Tick as appropriate)Signature of Applicant:

Date:

Signature of Director of Studies: JBW Date: 01.10.11

This form together with a copy of the research proposal should be submitted to the Research Institute Director for consideration by the Research Institute Ethics Committee/Panel

Note you cannot commence collection of research data until this form has been approved

SECTION B To be completed by the Research Institute Ethics Committee:

Comments:

Approved²

Signature Chair of Research Institute Ethics Committee:

Date:

This form should then be filed with the RS1 form

If in the judgement of the committee there are significant ethical issues for which there is not agreed practice then further ethical consideration is required before approval can be given and the proposal with the committees comments should be forwarded to the secretary of the UREC for consideration.

There are significant ethical issues which require further guidance

Signature Chair of Research Institute Ethics Committee:

Date:

This form together with the recommendation and a copy of the research proposal should then be submitted to the University Research Ethics Committee

² Approval of this ethics proposal was confirmed by the research degrees committee. A copy is in the researcher's file.

Appendix D – Participant information Sheet

Participant Information Sheet

Primary Headteachers' perceptions of schools' roles in training teachers to be outstanding practitioners

Principal: Elaine Barron, University of Bedfordshire

Investigators: Professor Janice Wearmouth and Professor Patrick Carmichael, University of Bedfordshire

Project date: Sept 2013 – May 2014

Email: elaine.barron@beds.ac.uk ; Janice.wearmouth@beds.ac.uk,
patrick.carmichael@eds.ac.uk

Telephone: 01582 743099 (E. Barron), 01234 793153 (J. Wearmouth), 01234 793100 (P. Carmichael)

1. **Study title**

Primary Headteachers' perceptions of schools' roles in training teachers to be outstanding practitioners

2. **Invitation paragraph**

You are being invited to take part in a research study. Before you decide it is important for you to understand why the research is being done and what it will involve. Please take time to read the following information carefully and discuss it with others if you wish. Ask us if there is anything that is not clear or if you would like more information. Take time to decide whether or not you wish to take part.

3. **What is the purpose of the study?**

The purpose of this study is to investigate the perceptions of primary school Headteachers on the role schools can play in supporting trainee teachers to be the best teacher they can be. It is set in the context of the changing governmental approach to Initial Teacher Training whereby the majority of the training year will be spent in schools and the widening of the School Direct programme, as expressed in Training the Next Generation of Outstanding Teachers. The study seeks to capture the voices of Headteachers experienced in ITT within their schools to investigate what they perceive to be the opportunities and the challenges of this change in policy.

4. **Why have I been chosen?**

Participants have been selected from the partnership SCITT provider with which the principal researcher undertakes work. Headteachers with more than three years' experience, who have led the participation of their school in at least two modes of ITT training (RTP, GTP, PGCE and/or BEd) and whose school has a current Ofsted grade of Outstanding or Good. Subsequent participants may result through 'snowball selection' whereby an initial

participant suggests a headteacher colleague who may be interested in participating in the study. A total of twenty Headteachers will be invited to participate in the research.

5. Do I have to take part?

It is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. If you do decide to take part you will be given this information sheet to keep and be asked to sign a consent/assent form. If you decide to take part you are still free to withdraw at any time and without giving a reason. A decision to withdraw at any time, or a decision not to take part, will not affect any professional work undertaken at any point with the principal researcher.

6. What will happen to me if I take part?

The principal researcher will make an appointment at a convenient time to you to visit you at your school to conduct an interview lasting no longer than one and a half hours. The interview will have a set of themes to discuss which are designed to allow participants to reflect on their involvement in teacher training, what they believe to be the opportunities and the challenges this brought their school and for them to reflect on their professional views on the government's changes to ITT. The interview will be recorded and subsequently transcribed. No identification of you or your school will be made in the transcription. Following an initial analysis of the first set of twenty interviews the principal researcher will seek to follow up key findings with a set of subsequent interviews with six of the original participants in June/July 2014. The researcher will contact participants directly to request their participation in another interview of approximately one and half hours to pursue the initial findings.

7. What are the possible benefits of taking part?

The benefits of participating in this research are the opportunity to reflect on your professional perceptions of the issue being researched and to be part of a group of Headteachers whose views on ITT are recorded at this stage of changes to ITT provision. The research does not seek to compare provision in any of the schools but rather to capture the voices of Headteachers at this point in time.

8. Will my taking part in this study be kept confidential?

All information which is collected about you during the course of the research will be kept strictly confidential.

Interviews will be recorded on a voice recorder and on return to her university office the principal researcher will transfer the recording to a password protected desk computer of which she is the only user using both the computer memory and the university's shared drive. The recorded interview will then be delete form the voice recorder. The recordings will be sent to a professional firm for transcription (<http://transcriptdivas.co.uk/>). Only the principal researcher and the transcribing service will have the opportunity to listen to the recordings. When transcriptions are received the researcher will redact all identifying words and phrases and save the redacted transcripts to the desktop and shared drive. The recorded interviews will then be deleted from the desk and shared drives. The principal and the investigative researchers will have access to the redacted transcripts. These transcripts will be presented in appendices to the final report which will be a publicly available document.

9 What will happen to the results of the research study?

The research study will be published after September, 2015, and will be available on request from the University of Bedfordshire.

10 **Contacts for Further Information**

Elaine Barron – elaine.barron@beds.ac.uk Tel: 01582 743099

Professor Janice Wearmouth – janice.wearmouth@beds.ac.uk Tel: 01234 793153

Professor Patrick Carmichael – patrick.carmichael@beds.ac.uk Tel: 01234 793100

*'Alternatively, if you would like to speak with someone independent from the research study please contact: Professor Uvanney Maylor: Head of the Institute for Research in Education
Email: uvanney.maylor@beds.ac.uk, Telephone: 01234 93398*

Thank you for taking your time to read this information letter

Please keep this form for your records.

Appendix E: Questions for main study interview (Pilot Version)

Interview School Number			
Date of interview			
Ofsted Grade at time of interview			
Years as HT		Years of ITT	
Own route	BEd	PGCE	R/GTP

Draft Title

Primary School Headteachers' perceptions of the challenges and opportunities for schools in supporting trainee teachers to be the best teacher they can be

Semi-Structured interview themes:

What does an outstanding teacher look like?

What in your experience supports trainee teachers to become outstanding teachers?

What from your experience do schools need to do to support trainee teachers to become outstanding teachers?

Reflecting on changes to teacher training you have experienced, what have been the high and the low points?

What forms of ITT are you currently participating in? How does they support the development of outstanding teachers?

What would you like to see now to support trainee teachers to become outstanding teachers?

Any further comments?

Appendix F: Questions for main study interview

Interview School Number			
Date of interview			
Ofsted Grade at time of interview			
Years as HT		Years of ITT	
Own route	BEd	PGCE	R/GTP

Draft Title

Primary School Headteachers' perceptions of the challenges and opportunities for schools in supporting trainee teachers to be the best teacher they can be

Semi-Structured interview Questions:

What does an outstanding teacher look like?

Over time what have been the systems and frameworks in your experience which have supported trainee teachers to become outstanding teachers?

What from your experience needs to be in place in schools to support trainee teachers to become outstanding teachers?

Reflecting on changes to teacher training you have experienced, what have been the high and the low points?

What forms of ITT are you currently participating in? How does each support the development of outstanding teachers?

What would you like to see now as the framework to support trainee teachers to become outstanding teachers?

Any further comments?

References

- Abend, G. (2008) 'The meaning of theory' *Sociological Theory*, 26 (2), pp. 173-199
- Adelman, C. (1980) Rethinking Case Study: notes from the Second Cambridge Conference in
Simons, H. Ed. *Towards a Science of the Singular*. Centre for Applied Research in Education:
University of East Anglia, 45 – 61 in L. Cohen, L. Manion and K. Morrison (2000) *Research
Methods in Education*. 5th Ed. London: Routledge Falmer
- Ahern, K. (1999) 'Ten Tips for Reflexive Bracketing' *Qualitative Health Research*, 9, pp. 407-
11
- Alexander, R. (1993) Old Myths Die Hard. *The Times*, 7th June
- Alexander, R. ed. (2010) *Children, their World, their Education: Final report and
recommendations of the Cambridge Primary Review*. Abingdon: Routledge
- Allen, J. and Wright, S. (2013) 'Integrating theory and practice in pre-service teacher
education practicum' *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 20 (2), pp. 136-151
- Allen, R. and Allnutt, J. (2013) *Matched panel data estimates of the impact of Teach First on
school and department performance*. London: IoE
- Alvesson, M. and Deetz, S. (2000) *Doing Critical Management Research*. London: Sage
- Aplin, R. (2001) The Changing Face of Initial Secondary Teacher Education in England 1984 –
98 in Y. Cheng, K. Chow and K. Tsui (eds). (2001) *New Teacher Education for the Future:
International perspectives*. Hong Kong Institute of Education: Kluwer Academic
- Arthur, J., Waring, M., Coe, R. and Hedges, L. (2012) *Research Methods and Methodologies
in Education*. London: Sage
- Asptors, J. and Bondas, T. (2013) 'Caring about Caring: Newly qualified teachers'
experienced of their relationships within the school community', *Teachers and Teaching:
Theory and Practice*, 19 (3), pp. 243-259
- Avis, J. (2011) 'More of the same? New Labour, the Coalition and education: markets,
localism and social justice.' *Educational Review*, 63 (4), pp. 421-438
- Ball, S. (1997) 'Good School/Bad School: paradox and fabrication'. *British Journal of
Sociology in Education*, 18 (3), pp. 317-336
- Ball, S. (2003) 'The Teachers' Soul and the Terrors of Performativity' *Journal of Education
Policy*, 18 (2), pp.215-218
- Ball, S. (2013) *The Education Debate*. 2nd Ed. Bristol: Policy Press
- Bandura, A. (1993) 'Perceived self-efficacy in cognitive development and functioning.'
Educational Psychologist, 28, pp. 117-148
- Barr, A. (1958) 'Characteristics of successful teachers' *Phi Delta Kappan*, 63 (6), pp. 282-284

Barrick, M., Swider, B. and Stewart, G. (2010) 'Initial Evaluations in the Interview: Relationships with Subsequent Interviewer Evaluations and Employment Offers' *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95 (6), pp.1163-1172

BBC (2015a) *Rise in school teacher vacancies in England*. [Online] Available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-33363958> (Accessed 01.08.15)

BBC (2015b) *More new teachers leaving the profession, says ATL leader*. [Online] Available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-32044475> (Accessed 01.08.15)

BBC (2015c) Plan to cut 'excessive' teacher work announced by ministers. [Online] Available at: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/education-31164580> (Accessed: 30.05.15)

Beck, C. and Kosnik, C. (2002) 'Professors and the Practicum: Involvement of university faculty in pre-service practicum supervision' *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53 (1), pp. 6 – 19

Beck, J. (2009) 'Appropriating professionalism: restructuring the official knowledge base of England's 'modernised' teaching profession' *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 30 (1), pp. 3-14

Beishuizen, J., Hof, E., Van Putten, C., Bouwmeester, S. & Asscher, J. (2001) 'Students' and Teachers' Cognitions about Good Teachers' *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 71 (2), pp 185-201

Bell, J. (2010) *Doing Your Research Project: A guide for first-time researchers in education, health and social science*. Buckingham: OUP

BERA (2011) *Ethical Guidelines for Educational Research*. London: BERA

Berg, B. (1998) *Qualitative research Methods for the Social Sciences 3rd Ed*. Needham Heights: Allyn & Bacon

Bernstein, B. (1974) Sociology and the sociology of education: a brief account in Rex, J. (ed.) *Approaches to Sociology: an introduction to major trends in British sociology*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul

Bitan, K., Haep, A. and Steins, G. (2014) 'School inspections still in dispute – an exploratory study of school principals' perceptions of school inspections' *International Journal of Leadership in Education: Theory and Practice*. Available at: <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/13603124.2014.958199> (Accessed: 21.05.15)

Black-Hawkins, K. and Florian, L. (2012) 'Classroom teachers' craft knowledge of their inclusive practice' *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 18 (5), pp. 567-584

Blake, D. (1997) The Place of Higher Education in Teacher Education in K. Watson, C. Modgill, and S. Modgill (eds.) *Educational Dilemmas: Debate and Diversity Vol. 1 Teachers, Teacher Education and Training*. London: Cassell

Blake, D. and Hanley, V. (1998) 'The Views of Recently Qualified Primary PGCE Teachers and their Headteachers on Effective Initial Teacher Education' *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 22 (1), pp. 15-24

- Bloomfield, D. (2009) 'Working within and against neoliberal accreditation agendas: Opportunities for Professional Experience'. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 37, pp. 27-44
- Boffey, D. (2015) Teacher shortages and rising pupil numbers puts schools on edge of crisis. [Online] Available at: <http://www.theguardian.com/education/2015/aug/29/schools-trouble-rising-pupils-teacher-shortage-uk-crisis> (Accessed 05.09.15)
- Bolton, G. (2010) *Reflective Practice: Writing and Professional Development* 3rd Ed. London: Sage
- Booth, M., Furlong, J. and Wilkin, M. (1990) *Partnership in Initial Teacher Training*. London: Cassell
- Bottery, M. and Wright, N. (2002) *Teachers and the State: Towards a Directed Profession*. Abingdon: Routledge
- Boustead, M. (2015) I predicted this catastrophe in teacher supply – it should have been avoided. [Online] Available at: <http://www.atlspeakout.com/2015/04/28/i-predicted-this-catastrophe-in-teacher-supply-it-should-have-been-avoided/> (Accessed 05.09.15)
- Boyd, P. (2002) 'Rose tinted reflection? The benefits for teachers of initial teacher education in secondary schools.' *Journal of In-Service Education*, 28 (2), pp. 203-217
- Boyd, P., Harris, K. and Murray, J. (2007) *Becoming a Teacher Educator: Guidelines for the Induction of Newly Appointed Lecturers in Initial Teacher Education*. Bristol: University of Bristol
- Boyd, P., Harris, K. and Murray, J. (2011) *Becoming a Teacher Educator: Guidelines for the Induction of Newly Appointed Lecturers in Initial Teacher Education*. 2nd Ed. Bristol: University of Bristol
- Boyd, P. and Tibke, J. (2013) 'Being a school-based teacher educator: developing pedagogy and identity in facilitating work-based higher education in a professional field.' *Practical Research in Higher Education Journal*, 6 (2), pp. 41-57
- Brinia, V., Zimianiti, L. and Panagiolopoulos, K. (2014) 'The role of principals' emotional intelligence in primary education leadership' *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 42 (4), pp. 28-44
- Brisard, E., Menter, I. and Smith, I. (2005) *Models of partnership in programmes of initial teacher education*. Edinburgh: General Teaching Council of Scotland
- Brooks, V. (2000) 'School-based Initial Teacher Training: Squeezing a quart into a pint pot or a square peg into a round hole?' *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 8 (2), pp. 99-112
- Brooks, V. (2006) 'A 'quiet revolution'? The impact of Training Schools on initial teacher training partnerships' *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 32 (4), pp. 379-393

Brown, M., Ralph, S. and Brember, I. (2002) 'Change-linked work-related stress in British teachers' *Research in Education*, 67, pp.1-12

Browne, L. and Reid, J. (2012) 'Changing localities for teacher training: the potential impact on professional formation and the university sector response' *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 38 (4), pp. 497-508

Bryant, A. and Charmaz, K. (2011) Grounded Theory in Williams, M. and Vogt, W. *The SAGE Handbook of Innovation in Social Research Methods*. London: Sage

Burn, K. (2006) 'Promoting Critical Conversations: The distinctive contribution of higher education as a partner in the professional preparation of teachers' *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 32 (3), pp. 243-258

Burton, D. (2000) *Research Training for Social Scientists*. London: Sage

Bush, T. (2013) 'Preparing Headteachers in England: Professional Certification, not Academic Learning' *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 41 (4), pp. 453-465

Cable, D. and Judge, T. (1997) 'Interviewers' Perceptions of Person-Organisation Fit and Organisational Selection Decisions' *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82 (4), pp. 546-561

Coldron, J., Williams, J., Fathallah-Caillau, I. & Stephenson, K. (2003) 'What are the benefits to schools' involvement with initial teacher training?' Sheffield, Sheffield Hallam University School of Education, 16

Carlgren, I. (1996) Professionalism and Teachers as Designers in M. Kompf, W. Bond, D. Dworet, and R. Boak (eds.) *Changing Research and Practice: Teachers' Professionalism, Identities and Knowledge*. London: Falmer Press

Carney, S. (2003) 'Learning from School-based Teacher Training: possibilities and constraints for experienced teachers' *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 47 (4), pp. 413-429

Case, P., Case, S. and Catling, S. (2000) 'Please Show You're Working: a critical assessment of the impact of Ofsted inspection on primary teachers' *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 21 (4), pp. 605-621

Castells, M. (2000) *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford: Blackwell

Charmaz, K. (1991) 'Translating graduate qualitative methods into undergraduate teaching: Intensive interviewing as a case example.' *Teaching Sociology*, 35 (2), pp. 269-288

Charmaz, K. (2000) Grounded Theory: Objectivist and constructivist methods in N. Denzin, and Y. Lincoln (eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, 2nd Ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage

Charmaz, K. (2006) *Constructing Grounded Theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. London: Sage

Charmaz, K. (2014) *Constructing Grounded Theory* 2nd Ed. London: Sage

- Childs, A. and Merrill, S. (2003) 'Professional mentors' perceptions of the contribution of school/HEI partnerships to professional development and school improvement' *Professional Development Today*, Spring, pp. 17-20
- Childs, A. (2013) 'The work of English Educators: An English policy perspective.' *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 39 (3), pp. 314-328
- Clarke, A. (2005) *Situational Analysis: Grounded theory after the post-modern turn*. Thousand Oaks: Sage
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2004) 'Taking stock in 2004: Teacher education in dangerous times' *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55 (1), pp. 3-7
- Cochran-Smith, M. (2006) *Policy, Practice and Politics in Teacher Education: Editorials from the Journal of Teacher Education*. AACTE: Corwin Press
- Cohen, L. Manion, L. And Morrison, K. (2000) *Research Methods in Education*. 5th Ed. London: Routledge Falmer
- Corbetta, P. (2003) *Social Research: Theory, methods and techniques*. London: Sage
- Corbin, J. and Strauss, A. (2008) *Basics of Qualitative Research 3rd Ed*. London: Sage
- Courtney, S. (2013) 'Head teachers' experiences of school inspection under Ofsted's January 2012 framework' *Management in Education*, 27 (4), pp. 164-169
- Cox, C. (1989) *Learning to Teach*. London: Hillgate Group
- Creswell, J. (2007) *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design: Choosing among five approaches*. 2nd Ed Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Cross, R. (1999) 'What time constraints face the junior school teachers taking on the role of student mentor?' *Mentoring and Tutoring*, 7 (1), pp. 5-22
- Crow, G. (2007) 'The Professional and Organizational Socialization of New English Headteachers in School Reform Contexts' *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 35 (1), pp. 51-71
- Cuddapah, J. and Clayton, C. (2011) 'Using Wenger's Communities of Practice to Explore a New Teacher Cohort.' *Journal of Teacher Education*, 62 (1), pp. 62-75
- Darling-Hammond, L. and Brailsford, J. (eds.) (2005) *Preparing Teachers to Teach for a Changing World: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass
- Davies, B. (2006) *Leading the Strategically Focused School: Success and Sustainability*. London: Sage
- Day, S. (2012) 'A Reflexive Lens: Exploring Dilemmas of Qualitative Methodology Through the Concept of Reflexivity' *Qualitative Sociology Review*, 8 (1), pp. 60-85
- Denscombe, M. (2002) *Ground Rules for Good Research: A 10 point guide for social researchers*. Buckingham: OUP

- Denscombe, M. (2010) *The Good Research Guide*. Buckingham: OUP
- Dent, H. (1977) *The Training of Teachers in England and Wales 1800 to 1975*. London: Hodder and Stoughton
- Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. Eds. (2000) *Handbook of Qualitative Research, 2nd Ed*. Thousand Oaks: Sage
- Denzin, N. and Lincoln, Y. Eds. (2003) *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and issues*. Thousand Oaks: Sage
- DES (1983) *Teaching Quality* London: HMSO
- DES (1984) *Initial Teacher Training: Approval of Courses (Circular 3/84)*. London: DES
- DES (1989) *Initial Teacher Training: Approval of Course (Circular 24/89)*. London: DES
- DfE (1992) *Initial Teacher Training for Secondary Schools (Circular 9/92)*. London: DfE
- DfE (1993) *Initial Teacher Training for Primary Schools (Circular 14/93)*. London: DfE
- DfE (2010a) *The Case for Change*. London: DfE
- DfE (2010b) *The Importance of Teaching: The Schools White Paper*. London: DfE
- DfE (2011a) *Training our next generation of outstanding teachers: an improvement strategy for discussion*. London: Crown Copyright
- DfE (2011b) *Teachers' Standards*. London: DfE
- DfE (2011c) *Teachers' Standards: Guidance for school leaders, school staff and governing bodies*. London: DfE
- DfE (2013) *Schools, pupils and their characteristics*. [Online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/schools-pupils-and-their-characteristics-january-2013> (Accessed: 02.10.13)
- DfE (2014) *Pupil premium: funding and accountability for schools* [Online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/pupil-premium-information-for-schools-and-alternative-provision-settings> Accessed (05.04.16)
- DfE (2015) *ITT performance profiles management information: 2013 to 2014* [Online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/itt-performance-profiles-management-information-2013-to-2014> Accessed (05.04.16)
- DfEE (1997a) *Excellence in Schools*. London: Stationery Office
- DfEE (1997b) *Teaching: High Status, High Standards*. London: DfEE
- DfES/TTA (2002) *Qualifying to Teach* London: HMSO

- Douglas, A. (2011) 'The different learning opportunities afforded student teachers in four secondary school subject departments in an initial teacher education school-university partnership in England' *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 37 (1), pp. 93-106
- Dourdouma, A. and Mortl, K. (2012) 'The Creative Journey of Grounded Theory Analysis: A guide to its principles and applications' *Research in Psychotherapy: Process and Outcomes*, 15 (2), pp. 96-106
- Dufour, R. and Eaker, R. (1998) *Professional Learning Communities at Work: Best practices for enhancing student achievement*. Bloomington: NES
- Dworkin, S. (2012) 'Sample Size Policy for Qualitative Studies using In-Depth Interviews' *Archives of Sexual Behaviour*, 41 (6), pp. 1319-1320
- Earley, P. and Weindling, D. (2007) 'Do School Leaders have a Shelf Life?' *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 35 (1), pp. 73-88
- Eaude, T. (2014) 'What makes primary teachers special? Exploring the features of expertise in the primary classroom' *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice*, 20 (1), pp. 4-18
- Edwards, A. (1997) 'Guest bearing gifts: the position of student teachers in primary school classrooms' *British Educational Research Journal*, 23 (1), pp. 27-37
- Edwards, A. and Protheroe, L. (2004) 'Teaching by Proxy: Understanding how mentors are positioned in partnership' *Oxford Review of Education*, 30 (2), pp. 183-197
- Eliot, J. (1996) *Reconstructing Teacher Education: Teacher development*. London: Falmer Press
- Elliott, J. (1991) 'A Model of Professionalism and its Implications for Teacher Education' *British Educational Research Journal*, 17 (4), pp. 309-318
- Ellis, C. and Bochner, A. (2003) Autoethnography, Personal Narrative, Reflexivity in N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (eds.) *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*. Thousand Oaks: Sage
- English, H. and English, A. (1958) *A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytical Terms*. London: Longman
- Eraut, M. (2004) 'Informal learning in the workplace' *Studies in Continuing Education*, 26 (2), pp. 247-273
- Feiman-Nemser, S. (2001) 'From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching.' *Teachers College Record*, 103 (6), pp. 1013-1055
- Field, K. and Philpott, C. (2000) 'The impact of hosting student teachers on school effectiveness and school improvement' *Journal of In-Service Education*, 26 (1), pp. 115-136
- Foster, R. (2000) 'The Graduate Teacher Programme – just the job?' *Journal of In-service Education*, 26 (2), pp. 297 -309

- Foster, R. (2001) 'The Graduate Teacher Route to QTS – motorway, by-way or by-pass?' *Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the British Educational Research Association, University of Leeds, England, 13th – 15th September 2001*
- Foster, D. (2016) 'Teachers: Supply, retention and workload'. Briefing Paper, *House of Commons Library*, No. 7222, 12th February 2016
- Freedman, S. (2014) *How many of our teachers stay in the classroom?* [Online] Available at: <http://www.teachfirst.org.uk/blog/how-many-our-teachers-stay-classroom> (Accessed: 31.01.15)
- Frosch, S. and Emerson, P. (2005) 'Interpretation and Over-interpretation: Disputing the Meaning of Texts' *Qualitative Research*, 5 (3), pp. 307-324
- Fullen, M., Rincon-Gallardo, S. and Hargreaves, A. (2015) 'Professional Capital as Accountability' *Educational Policy Analysis Archives*, 23 (15), pp. 1-19
- Furlong, J. (1990) School-based Training: The students' views in M. Booth, J. Furlong and M. Wilkin (eds.) *Partnership in Initial Teacher Training*. London: Cassell
- Furlong, J. (2008) 'Making teaching a 21st century profession: Tony Blair's big prize' *Oxford Review of Education*, 34 (6), pp. 727-739
- Furlong, J., Barton, S., Miles, C., Whiting, C. and Whitty, G. (2000) *Teacher Education in Transition: Reforming professionalism?* Buckingham: OUP
- Furlong, J., McNamara, O., Campbell, A., Howson, J. and Lewis, S. (2008) 'Partnership, Policy and Politics: Initial teacher education in England under New Labour' *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 14 (4), pp. 307 – 318
- Garcia, M. (2004) 'Antecedent of an Interviewer's Fit Perceptions of an Applicant: The role of perceived similarity' [Online] Available at: <http://oaktrust.library.tamu.edu/handle/1969.1/2787> (Accessed: 02.04.15)
- Garcia, M., Posthuma, R. and Colella, A. (2008) 'Fit perception in the employment interview: The role of similarity, liking and expectations.' *Journal of Occupation and Organisational Psychology*, 81, pp. 173-189
- Garfinkel, H. (1967) *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall
- Garmarnikow, E. and Green, A. (2003) Social Justice, identity formation and social capital in C. Vincent, Ed. *Social Justice, Education and Identity*. London: Routledge pp.209-223
- Geertz, C. (1973) ed. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books
- Gibb, N. (2015) *The Importance of Teaching: Speech delivered to Research Education Conference, London on 5th September 2015*. [Online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/nick-gibb-the-importance-of-the-teaching-profession> (Accessed: 05.09.15)
- Giddens, A. (1976) *New Rules of Sociological Method: a positive critique of interpretative sociologies*. London: Hutchinson

- Gilbert, A. and Sliep, Y. (2009) 'Reflexivity in the practice of social interaction: from self to inter-relational reflexivity' *South African Journal of Psychology*, 39 (4), pp. 468-479
- Gillard, D. (2011) *Education in England: A brief history*. [Online] Available at: <http://www.educationengland.org.uk/history> (Accessed 02.04.15)
- Gilroy, P. (2014) 'Policy interventions in teacher education: sharing the English experience' *Journal of Education for Teaching: International research and pedagogy*, 40 (5), pp. 622-632
- Glaser, B. G. (1978) *Theoretical Sensitivity*. Mill Valley: Sociology Press
- Glaser, B. G. (1998) *Doing Grounded Theory: Issues and discussion*. Mill Valley: Sociology Press
- Glaser, B.G. and Strauss, A.L. (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*. Chicago: Aldane
- Golafshani, N. (2003) 'Understanding Reliability and Validity in Qualitative Research' *The Qualitative Report*, 8 (4), pp. 597-607
- Goodman, C. (2002) 'Government Policy and the Provision of Teachers' *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 50 (1), pp. 76 – 99
- Gove, M. (2010) *Speech to Parliament to Introduce the Schools White Paper on 24th November 2010*. [Online] Available at: http://www.michaelgove.com/content/schools_white_paper_speech (Accessed 28.04.11)
- Gove, M. (2012) *Speech to the National College Annual Conference on 14th June*, [Online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/michael-gove-at-the-national-college-annual-conference> (Accessed 05.04.14)
- Gove, M. (2014) *Speech to the London Academy of Excellence on 3rd February*, [Online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/michael-gove-at-the-national-college-annual-conference> (Accessed on 05.04.14)
- Grossman, P. and McDonald, M. (2008) 'Back to the future: Directions of research in teaching and teacher education' *American Educational Research Journal*, 45 (1), pp. 184-205
- Grossman, P., Hammerness, K. and McDonald, M. (2009) 'Redefining Teaching, Re-imaging Teacher Education' *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and practice*, 15 (2), pp. 273 – 289
- Guest, G., Bunce, A. and Johnson, L. (2006) 'How many interviews are enough? An experiment with data saturation and variability' *Field Methods*, 18 (1), pp. 59-82
- Gunter, H. (2012) *Leadership and the Reform of Education*. Bristol: The Policy Press.
- Hagger, H. and McIntyre, D. (2006) *Learning Teaching from Teachers: Realising the potential of school-based teacher education*. Maidenhead: OUP
- Hall, C. and Noyes, A. (2009) 'New Regimes of Truth: The impact of performative school self-evaluation systems on teachers' professional identities' *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25, pp. 850-856

- Hammersely, M. (1987) 'Some Notes on the Terms Validity and Reliability.' *British Educational Research Journal*, 13 (1), pp. 73-81
- Hammersley, M. (2001) 'Can and should educational research be educative?' *Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the British Educational Research Association, University of Leeds, September 2001*. [Online] Available at: <http://www.leeds.ac.uk/educol/documents/00001818.htm> (Accessed 11.02.2009)
- Hanushek, E. (2016) 'What matters for student achievement?' *Education Next*, Spring, pp. 19-26
- Harford, S. (2015) *Speech to the Association of School and College Leaders Conference on 20th March*, [Online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/speech-to-association-of-school-and-college-leaders-conference-2015> (Accessed 02.04.15)
- Hargreaves, A. (2000) 'Four Ages of Professionalism and Professional Learning' *Teachers and teaching: History and Practice*, 6 (2), pp. 151-182
- Hargreaves, A. and Fullan, M. (2012) *Professional Capital*. New York: TCP
- Hargreaves, D. (1993) A Common Sense Model of the Professional Development of Teachers in J. Elliot (ed.) *Reconstructing Teacher Education*. Lewes: Falmer
- Hargreaves, D. (1994) *The Mosaic of Learning: Schools and teachers for the next century*. London: Demos
- Hargreaves, D. (2012) *A self-improving school system: towards maturity*. Nottingham: NCSL
- Harris, R. (2011) 'Learning how to be a teacher – lessons the government needs to learn' *Prospero*, 17 (3), pp.28-33
- Harrison, J. (2006) 'An examination of the language and interpretations of 'Standard one' for initial teacher training in England: professional values and practice - outcomes or opportunities?' *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 29 (4), pp. 431-454
- Hartas, D. Ed. (2010) *Educational Research and Inquiry: Qualitative and quantitative approaches*. London: Continuum
- Hatch, J. (2002) *Doing Qualitative Research in Education Settings*. Albany: Suny Press
- Hattie, J. (2003) *Teachers Make a Difference: What is the research evidence?* [Online] Available at: [https://cdn.auckland.ac.nz/assets/education/hattie/docs/teachers-make-a-difference-ACER-\(2003\).pdf](https://cdn.auckland.ac.nz/assets/education/hattie/docs/teachers-make-a-difference-ACER-(2003).pdf) (Accessed: 04.06.16)
- Hattie, J. (2009) *Visible learning: A synthesis of 800+ meta-analysis on achievement*. London: Routledge
- Hattie, J. (2012) *Visible Learning for Teachers: Maximising impact on learning*. London: Routledge
- Hawkes, M. and Romiszowski, K. (2001) 'Examining the Reflective Outcomes of Asynchronous Computer-mediated Communication on In-service Teacher Development' *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 9 (2), pp. 285 – 308

Hay McBer (2000) *Research into Teacher Effectiveness: A model of teacher effectiveness. Report by Hay McBer to the DfEE June 2000*. London: Hay McBer

Hayes, D. (1999) 'Opportunity and obstacles in the competency-based training and assessment of primary teachers in England' *Harvard Educational Review*, 69 (1), pp. 1-29

Helsby, G. (1996) 'Defining and developing professionalism in English secondary schools' *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 22 (2), pp. 135-148

Hiebert, J., Gallimore, R. and Stigler, J. (2002) 'A knowledge base for the teaching profession: What would it look like and how can I get one?' *Educational Researcher*, 31 (5), pp. 3-15

Hitchcock, G. & Hughes, D. (1995) *Research and the Teacher* 2nd Ed. London: Routledge

Hobson, A. (2003) 'Trainee teachers' conceptions and evaluations of 'theory' in initial teacher training (ITT)' *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 11 (3), pp. 245-261

Hobson, A., Malderez, A., Tracey, L., Homer, M. S., Ashby, P., Mitchell, N., McIntyre, J., Cooper, D., Roper, T., Chambers, G.N. and Tomlinson, P.D. (2009). *Becoming a Teacher: Teachers' experiences of initial teacher training, induction and early professional development: Final Report*. London: DCSF

Hodgson, A. and Spours, K. (2011) 'Three versions of 'localism': Implications for upper secondary education and lifelong learning in the UK' *Journal of Education Policy*, 27 (2), pp. 193-210

Hodkinson, H. and Hodkinson, P. (2004) 'Rethinking the concept of community of practice in relation to school teachers' workplace learning' *International Journal of Training and Development*, 8 (1), pp. 21-31

Hodson, E., Smith, K. and Brown, T. (2012) 'Reasserting theory in professionally based initial teacher education' *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 18(2), pp. 181-195

Holmes, G. and Abington-Cooper, M. (2000) 'Pedagogy vs. Andragogy: A False Dichotomy?' *The Journal of Technology Studies*, 26 (2) [Online] Available at: <http://scholar.lib.vt.edu/ejournals/JOTS/Summer-Fall-2000/holmes.html> (Accessed 02.01.14)

Horkheimer, M. (1972) *Critical Theory: Selected Essays* (translated by M. Connell et al.). New York: Herder and Herder

House of Commons Education Committee, The (2012) *Great teachers: attracting, training and retaining the best: Ninth report of session 2010-12*. London: The Stationery Office Ltd.

Hoyle, E. & John, P. (1995) *Professional Knowledge and Professional Practice*. London: Cassell

Hoyle, E. and John, P. (1998) 'Teacher Education: The Prime Suspect' *Oxford Review of Education*, 24 (1), pp. 69 – 82.

- Husbands, C. (2015) 'What are teaching schools for?' *Management in Education*, 29 (1), pp. 31-34
- Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) (2014) *The Cost Benefits of Different Initial Teacher Training Routes: IFS Report R100*. London: IFS
- Ions, E. (1977) *Against Behaviouralism: a critique of behavioural science*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell
- James Report, The (1972) *Teacher Education and Training: Report by a Committee of Inquiry appointed by the Secretary of State for Education and Science, under the Chairmanship of Lord James of Rusholme*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office 1972
- Jeffery, B. and Woods, P. (1998) *Testing Teachers: the effect of school inspections on primary teachers*. London: Falmer
- Jones, M. (1938) *The Charity School Movement*. Cambridge: CUP
- Jones, M. and Straker, K. (2006) 'What informs mentors' practice when working with trainees and newly qualified teachers?' *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 32 (2), pp. 165-184
- Jubilee Centre for Character & Virtues (JCCV) (2015) *The Good Teacher: Understanding virtues in practice*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham
- Keating, J. (2010) *Teacher Training – up to the 1960s*. London: IoE
- Kennedy, M. (2006) 'From Teacher Quality to Quality Teaching'. *Educational Leadership*, March, pp.14-19
- Kerlinger, F. (1970) *Foundations of Behavioural Research*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston
- Kitwood, T. (1977) *Values in adolescent life: towards a critical description* Unpublished PH.D dissertation, School Of Education, University of Bradford in L. Cohen, L. Manion and K. Morrison, K. (2000) *Research Methods in Education*. 5th Ed. London: Routledge Falmer
- Knowles, M. (1980) *The Modern Practice of Adult Education*. New York: The Adult Education Company
- Korthagen, F. (2004) 'In search of the essence of a good teacher: towards a more holistic approach in teacher education'. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 20, pp. 77-97
- Korthagen, F. (2010) 'Situated learning theory and the pedagogy of teacher education: Towards an integrative view of teacher behaviour and teacher learning.' *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26 (1), pp. 98-106
- Kutcher, E., Bragger, J. and Masco, J. (2013) 'How Interviewees Consider Content and Context Cues to Person-Organisation Fit'. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 21 (3), pp. 294-308

- Kydd, L. (1997) *Towards a Restructuring of Teachers' Professionalism* in K. Watson, C. Modgill and S. Modgill (eds.) *Educational Dilemmas: Debate and Diversity Vol. 1 Teachers, Teacher Education and Training*. London: Cassell
- Kyriacou, C. and Coulthard, M. (2000) 'Undergraduates' Views of Teaching as a Career Choice'. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 26 (2), pp. 117-126
- Kyriakides, L., Campbell, R. & Christofidou, F. (2002) 'Generating criteria for measuring teacher effectiveness through a self-evaluation approach'. *School Effectiveness & School Improvement*, 11 (4), pp. 501-529
- Lampert, M. (2009) 'Learning Teaching in, from and for Practice: What do we mean?' *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61 (1-2), pp. 21-34
- Landman, M. and Ozga, J. (1995) *Teacher Education Policy in England* in Ginsberg, M. and Lindsay, B. eds. *The Political Dimension in Teacher Education: Comparative perspectives on policy formation, socialization and society*. London: Falmer
- Lave, J. and Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated Learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge: CUP
- Lawlor, S. (1990) *Teachers Mis-taught*. London: Centre for Policy Studies
- Lawn, M. (1990) 'From Responsibility to Competency: A new context for curriculum studies in England and Wales'. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 22 (4), pp. 388 – 392
- Lawson, T., Heaton, T. and Brown, A. (2010) *Education & Training*. London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Layder, D. (1994) *Understanding Social Theory*. London: Sage
- LeCompte, M. and Schensul, J. (1999) *Designing and Conducting Ethnographic Research*. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira
- Lieberman, A. and Pointer Mace, D. (2009) 'The Role of Accomplished Teachers in Professional Learning Communities: Uncovering practice and enabling leadership'. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and practice*, 15 (2), pp. 459 – 470
- Lincoln, Y. and Guba, E. (1985) *Naturalistic Enquiry*. Beverly Hills: Sage
- Lincoln, Y. and Guba, E. (2003) Paradigmatic Controversies, Contradictions and Emerging Confluences in N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln (eds.) *The Landscape of Qualitative Research: Theories and issues*. Thousand Oaks: Sage
- Lipton, L. and Wellman, B. (2005) Cultivating Learning-focused Relationships between Mentors and their Protégés in H. Portner (ed.) *Teacher Mentoring and Induction*. Thousand Oaks: Sage
- Lock, N. (1995) 'School Experience in Initial Teacher Education: management issues for headteachers of primary schools'. *School Organisation*, 15 (3), pp. 313-315

Lofthouse, R. and Hall, E. (2014) 'Developing practices in teachers' professional dialogue in England: using Coaching Dimensions as an epistemic tool.' *Professional Development in Education*, 40 (5), pp. 758-778

Lunenberg, M. and Korthagen, F. (2009) 'Experience, theory and practical wisdom in teaching and teacher education'. *Teachers and Teaching*, 15 (2), pp. 225-240

McBeath, J. and Mortimore, P. (2001) *Improving School Effectiveness*. Buckingham: OUP

McNicholl, J. and Blake, A. (2013) 'Transforming teacher education, an activity theory analysis.' *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 39 (3), pp. 281-30

Malderez, A. and Wedell, M. (2007) *Teaching Teachers: Processes and practices*. London: Continuum

Mansell, W. (2010) 'Train or Educate Teachers?' *Kappan Magazine*, 92 (2), pp. 90-91

Marshall, B. (2015) Teacher Education: A revolution or a recipe for shortages? in Brighouse, T. (ed.) *What's Next for Education?* New Visions for Education Group [Online] Available at: <http://www.newvisionsforeducation.org.uk/election-2015/whats-next-for-education-buy-the-book/> (Accessed: 15.06.15)

Marshall, C. and Rossman, G. (2006) *Designing Qualitative Research*. 4th Ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage

Mason, R. and Schroeder, M. (2010) 'Principal hiring practices: Towards a reduction of uncertainty'. *The Clearing House*, 83, pp. 186-193

Matthews, R. and Ross, E. (2010) *Research Methods*. London: Pearson

May, T. (2011) *Social Research: Issues, Methods and Research*. Maidenhead: OUP

Maynard, T. (2000) 'Learning to Teach or Learning to Manage Mentors? Experiences of school-based teacher training'. *Mentoring and Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, 8 (1), pp. 17-30

Maynard, T. (2001) 'The student teacher and the school community of practice: a consideration of learning as participation'. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 31 (1), pp. 39-52

Mayotte, G. (2003) 'Stepping Stones to Success: previously developed career competencies and their benefits to career switchers transitioning to teaching'. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19, pp. 681 – 695.

McBride, R. Ed. (1996) *Teacher Education Policy: Some issues arising from research and practice*. London: Falmer

McLaughlin, M. and Talbert, J. (2006) *Building School-Based Teacher Learning Communities: Professional strategies to improve student achievement*. New York: TCP

McNair Report, The (1944) *Teachers and Youth Leaders: Report of the Committee appointed by the President of the Board of Education to consider the Supply, Recruitment and Training of Teachers and Youth Leaders*. London: His Majesty's Stationery Office 1944

McNally, J., Cope, P., Inglis, B. & Stronach, I. (1997) 'The student teacher in school: conditions for development'. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13 (5), pp. 485-498

McNamara, D. (1994) *Classroom Pedagogy and Primary Practice*. Abingdon: Routledge

Menzies, L., Parameshwaran, M., Trethewey, A., Shaw, B., Baars, S. and Chiong, C. *Why Teach?* London: LKMCo/Pearson

Miles, M.B. and Huberman, A.M. (1994) *Qualitative Data Analysis: An expanded source book*. 2nd Ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage

Mishler, E. G. (2000). Validation in inquiry-guided research: The role of exemplars in narrative studies in B. Brizuela, J. Stewart, R. Carrillo and J. Berger (eds.) *Acts of inquiry in qualitative research*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Educational Review

Moore, R. (1994) Partnership in M. Wilkin and D. Sankey, D. (eds.) *Collaboration and Transition in Initial Teacher Education*. London: Kogan Page

Morrison, N. (2014) *School direct failing to tackle the teacher shortage*. [Online] Available at: <https://www.tes.com/news/school-news/breaking-news/exclusive-dfe-starts-overseas-recruitment-drive-combat-staffing> (Accessed: 05.08.15)

Muijs, D. and Chapman, C. (2009) Accountability for Improvement: Rhetoric or Reality? in Chapman, C. and Gunter, H. (eds.) *Radical Reforms*, Abingdon: Routledge

Murray, J. and Male, T. (2005) 'Becoming a teacher educator: evidence from the field.' *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21 (2), pp. 125-142

Murray, J. and Passy, R. (2014) 'Primary teacher education in England: 40 years on' *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 40 (5), pp. 492-506

Mutton, T. and Butcher, J. (2008) "'We will take them from anywhere': schools working within multiple initial teacher training partnerships". *Journal of Education for Teaching: International Research and Pedagogy*, 34 (1), pp. 45-62

NAHT (1997) *Initial Teacher Education in England and Wales*. Haywards Heath: NAHT

Nield, R. and Farley-Ripple, E. (2008) 'Within-school variation in teacher quality: The case for the Ninth Grade.' *American Journal of Education*, 114, pp. 271-305

Nisbet, J. And Watt, J. (1984) *Case Study* in J. Bell, T. Bush, A. Fox, J. Goodey and S. Goulding (eds.) *Conducting Small-scale Investigations in Educational Management*. London: Harper Row

O'Brien, E. (2008) *The Racial Middle: Latinos and Asian Americans Living Beyond the Racial Divide*. New York: NYUP

O'Donoghue, T. (2007) *Planning Your Qualitative Research Project: An introduction to interpretivist research in education*. Abingdon: Routledge

- O'Hear, A. (1988) *Who Teaches the Teachers?* London: Social Affairs Unit
- Oancea, A. and Orchard, J. (2012) 'The Future of Teacher Education.' *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 46 (4), pp. 574-588
- Ofsted (2005) *An Employment-based Route into Teaching*. London: Crown Copyright
- Ofsted (2007) *An Employment-based Route into Teaching 2003- 2006*. . London: Crown Copyright
- Ofsted (2009) *Grade Criteria for the Inspection of Initial Teacher Education 2008-11. Revised November 2009*. Manchester: Ofsted
- Ofsted (2012) *Draft Trainee Characteristics in the ITE Initial Pilot Inspections Spring Term 2012*. Manchester: Ofsted
- Ofsted (2014b) *Ofsted Annual Report 2013/14: schools report*. [Online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ofsted-annual-report-201314-schools-report> (Accessed: 02.01.15)
- Ofsted (2014a) *The Framework for School Inspection*. [Online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-framework-for-school-inspection> (Accessed: 30.08.14)
- Oldroyd, D. (1986) *The Arch of Knowledge: an introductory study of the history of philosophy and methodology of science*. New York: Methuen
- Olsen, M. (1996) *Becoming a Trained Professional* in M. Kompf, W. Bond, D. Dworet and R. Boak (eds.) *Changing Research and Practice: Teachers' Professionalism, Identities and Knowledge*. London: Falmer Press
- Oppenheim, A. (1992) *Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement*. London: Pinter
- Osguthorpe, R. (2008) 'On the Reasons We Want Teachers of Good Disposition and Moral Character'. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59 (4), pp. 288-298
- Ozanne, W. (1997) Professionalism and Market Forces: With special reference to education in the United Kingdom in K. Watson, C. Modgill and S. Modgill (eds.) *Educational Dilemmas: Debate and Diversity Vol. 1 Teachers, Teacher Education and Training*. London: Cassell
- Ozga, J. (1995) Deskilling a profession: professionalism, deprofessionalism and the new managerialism in H. Busher and R. Saran (eds.) *Managing Teachers as Professionals*. London: Kogan Page
- Ozga, J. (200) *Policy Research in Educational Settings: contested terrains*. Buckingham: OUP
- Patton, M. (1990) *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*. Newbury Park: Sage
- Perryman, J. (2007) 'Inspection and Emotion'. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 37 (2), pp. 173-190
- Pollard, H. (1956) *Pioneers of Popular Education*. London: John Murray

- Portner, H. (2005) *Teacher Mentoring and Induction*. Thousand Oaks: Sage
- Potter, S. (2006) *Doing Postgraduate Research*. 2nd Ed. London: Sage
- Price, A. and Willett, J. (2006) 'Primary teachers' perceptions of the impact of initial teacher training upon primary schools'. *Journal of In-service Education*, 32 (1), pp. 33-45
- Rafferty, F. (2010) 'Just how well qualified should teachers be?' *Education Journal*, 121, p. 13
- Ranson, S. (2003) 'Public accountability in the age of neo-liberal governance.' *Journal of Education Policy*, 18 (5), pp. 459-480
- Raynor, S. (2014) 'Playing by the rules? The professional values of headteachers tested by the changing policy context'. *Management in Education*, 28 (2), pp. 38-43
- Reichel, N. & Arnon, S. (2009) 'A multicultural view of the good teacher in Israel' *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 15 (1), pp. 59-85
- Rennie, D. (2000) 'Grounded Theory Methodology as Methodical Hermeneutics: Recoiling realism and relativism' *Theory and Psychology*, 10 (4), pp. 481-502
- Rhodes, C., Brundrett, M. and Nevill, A. (2008) 'Leadership Talent Identification and development' *Educational Management, Administration and Leadership*, 36 (3), pp. 311-335
- Rich, R. (1977) *The Training of Teachers in England and Wales During the Nineteenth Century* 3rd Ed. Bath: Cedric Chivers
- Robson, C. (2002) *Real World Research*. 2nd Ed. Oxford: Blackwell
- Rogers, C. and Raider-Roth, M. (2006) Presence in teaching. *Teachers and Teaching*, 12 (3), pp. 265-287
- Rots, I. and Aelterman, A. (2009) 'Teacher education graduates' entrance into the teaching profession: Development and test of a model' *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 24 (4), pp. 453-471
- Rubin, H. and Rubin, I. (2005) *Qualitative Interviewing: the art of hearing data*. 2nd Ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage
- Ruddock, J. (1989) Accrediting Teacher Education Courses: the new criteria in Hargreaves, A. & Reynolds, D. eds. *Education Policies: Controversies and Critiques*. London: Falmer
- Russell, T. and Loughran, J. (2007) *Enacting a Pedagogy of Teacher Education: Values, relationships and practices*. Abingdon: Routledge
- Schneider, B. (1987) 'The people make the place' *Personnel Psychology*, 40, pp. 437-453
- Schwandt, T. (2000) *Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry: Interpretivism, hermeneutics, and social constructionism*. Newbury Park: Sage

- Scott, D. and Morrison, M. (2005) *Key Ideas in Educational Research*. London: Continuum
- Scott, D. and Usher, R. (1999) *Researching Education: Data, methods and theory in educational enquiry*. London: Continuum
- Seidman, I. (2006) *Interviewing as Qualitative Research: A Guide for Researchers in Education and the Social Sciences*. 3rd Ed. New York: Teacher College Press
- Senge, P. (1990) *The Fifth Discipline: The art and practice of the learning organisation*. London: Doubleday
- Shagrir, L. (2015) 'Working with students in higher education – professional conceptions of teacher educators.' *Teaching in Higher Education*, 20 (8), pp. 783-794
- Shaw, R. (2010) 'Embedding reflexivity within experiential qualitative psychology' *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 7 (3), pp. 233-243
- Shulman, L. (1998). 'Theory, practice, and the education of professionals' *The Elementary School Journal*, 98 (5), pp. 511-526
- Shulman, L. (2002) 'Making Differences: A table of learning.' *Change*, 36 (6), pp.36-44
- Sikes, P. (2006) 'Towards useful and dangerous theories discourse' *Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, 7 (1), pp. 43-51
- Silverman, D. (2011) *Interpreting Qualitative Data*. 4th Ed. London: Sage
- Silverman, D. (2013) *Doing Qualitative Research*. 4th Ed. London: Sage
- Sjolie, E. (2014) 'The role of theory in teacher education: reconsidered from a student teacher perspective' *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 46 (6), pp. 729-750
- Slater, H., Davies, N. and Burgess, S. (2012) 'Do teachers matter? Measuring variation in teacher effectiveness in England.' *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 74 (5), pp. 629-645
- Smith, F. (1923) *The Life and Work of Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth*. London: James Murray
- Smith, I., Brisard, E. and Menter, I. (2007) 'Models of partnership developments in initial teacher education in the four components of the United Kingdom: recent trends and current challenges' *Journal of Education for Teaching: International research and pedagogy*, 32 (2), pp. 147-164
- Smith, K. and Hodson, E. (2010) 'Theorising practice in initial teacher education' *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 36 (3), pp. 259-275
- Smith, K. and Lay, M. (2007) 'Curates' eggs? Secondary trainee teachers' experience of the Graduate Teacher Programme and the Post Graduate Certificate in Education' *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 33 (10), pp. 35-54
- Smith, K., Hodson, E. and Brown, T. (2013) 'Teacher educator changing perceptions of theory' *Educational Action Research*, 21 (2), pp. 237-252

- Sockett, H. (2009) 'Dispositions as Virtues' *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60 (3), pp. 291-303
- Spendlove, D., Howes, A. and Wake, G. (2010) 'Partnerships in Pedagogy: Refocusing of classroom lens' *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 33 (1), pp. 65-77
- Stake, R. (1995) *The Art of Case Study Research*. London: Sage
- Stephens, W. (1985) *Minutes and Reports of the Committee of Council on Education 1839-1899*. Leeds: Microform Academic Publishers
- Stevens, D. (2010) 'A Freirean Critique of the Competence Model of Teacher Education Focusing on the Standards for Qualified Teacher Status in England' *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 36 (2), pp. 187 -196
- Stewart, W. (2015) *DfE starts overseas recruitment drive to combat staffing crisis*. [Online] Available at: <https://www.tes.com/news/school-news/breaking-news/exclusive-dfe-starts-overseas-recruitment-drive-combat-staffing> (Accessed 05.09.15)
- Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1990) *Basics of Qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage
- Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1998) *Basics of Qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. 2nd Ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Swanson, P. (2011) Georgia's Grow-Your-Own Teacher Programs Attract the Right Stuff. *The High School Journal*, January, pp. 119-133
- Sweeney, B. (2001) *Best Practices in New Teacher Mentoring and Induction*. Wheaton: Best Practice Resources
- Talbott, M. (2007) Grow Your Own: Improving Illinois Schools for the Inside Out. *School Policy*, Spring/Summer, pp. 7-12
- Taubman, P. (2009) *Teaching by Numbers: Demonstrating the discourse of standards and accountability in education*. Abingdon: Routledge
- Taylor, A. (2008) 'Developing understanding about learning to teach in a university-schools partnership in England.' *British Educational Research Journal*, 34 (1), pp. 63-90
- Taylor, C. (2012) *Speech to the North of England Education Conference on 17th January*, [Online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/charlie-taylors-keynote-speech-to-the-north-of-england-education-conference> (Accessed: 05.04.14)
- TDA (2007) *Professional Standards for Qualified Teacher Status*. [Online] Available at: <http://www.tda.gov.uk/trainee-teacher/qts-standards.aspx> (Accessed on 27.04.11)
- TDA (2009) *Guidance to Accompany the Professional Standards for Qualified Teacher Status and Requirements for Initial Teacher Training*. London: TDA
- Teaching Agency (TA) (2012) *A Guide to School Direct 2013-14*. London: Crown Copyright

Thornberg, R. and Charmaz, K. (2011) Grounded Theory in S. Lapan, M. Quartaroli and F. Riemer (eds.) *Qualitative Research*. New Jersey: Jossey Bass

Times Education Supplement (TES) (2011) *Psychometric tests for all trainee teachers*. [Online] Available at: <http://newteachers.tes.co.uk/news/psychometric-tests-all-trainee-teachers/45672>. (Accessed: 02.09.13)

Tomlinson, C. (2015) 'Pondering Good vs Great' *Educational Leadership*, February, pp. 88-89

Tomlinson, S. (2005) *Education in a Post-Welfare Society*. 2nd Ed. Maidenhead: OUP

Troman, G. and Woods, P. (2000) 'Careers under stress: teacher adaptation at a time of intensive reform' *Journal of Educational Change*, 1 (3), pp. 253-275

Trotter, A., Ellison, L., & Davies, B. (1997). Determining and developing competencies in schools in B. Davies and L. Ellison (eds.) *School leadership for the 21st century: A competency and knowledge approach*. London: Routledge.

Trowler, P. (1995) *Investigating Education and Training*. London: Collins

Tuckman, B. (1965) 'Developmental sequence in small groups' *Psychological Bulletin*, 63 (6), pp. 384-399

Tuckman, B. (1972) *Conducting Educational Research*. New York: Harcourt

Turner-Bisset, R. (2001) *Expert Teaching*. London: Fulton

Tymms, P. (2012) Questionnaires in J. Arthur, M. Waring, R. Coe and L. Hedges (eds.) *Research Methods and Methodologies in Education*. London: Sage

Ulvik, M. and Sunde, E. (2013) 'The Impact of Mentor Education: Does mentor education matter?' *Professional Development in Education*, 39 (5), pp. 754-770

UUK (2014) *The Impact of Initial Teacher Training Reforms on English Higher Education Institutions*. London: UUK

Valencia, S., Martin, S., Place, N. and Grossman, P. (2009) 'Complex interactions in student teaching: Lost opportunities for learning.' *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60, pp. 304-322

Veeman, S., De Last, H. and Staring, C. (1998) 'Evaluation of a coaching programme for mentors of beginning teachers' *Journal of In-Service Education*, 24 (30), pp. 411-427

Wang, J. and Odell, S. (2002) Mentored Learning to Teach According to Standards-Based Reform: A critical review' *Review of Educational Research*, 72, pp. 481 – 546

Ward, H. (2015) *Teacher training applications drop as recruitment crisis fears intensify*. [Online] Available at: <https://www.tes.com/news/school-news/breaking-news/teacher-training-applications-drop-recruitment-crisis-fears-intensify> (Accessed: 05.08.15)

Webb, M., Pachler, N., Mitchell, H. and Herrington, N. (2007) 'Towards a pedagogy of mentor education' *Journal of In-Service Education*, 33 (2), pp. 171-188

- Wellman, B. and Berkowitz, S. Eds. (1988) *Social Structures: A network approach*. Cambridge: CUP
- Wenger, E. (1998) *Communities of Practice: Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge: CUP
- Wenger-Traynor, E., Fenton-O'Creevy, M., Hutchinson, S., Kubiak, C. and Wenger-Traynor, B. (eds) (2015) *Learning in Landscapes of Practice: Boundaries, Identity, and Knowledgeability in Practice –Based Learning*. Abingdon: Routledge
- Wilkin, M. (1990) The Development of Partnership in the United Kingdom in M. Booth, J. Furlong and M. Wilkin (eds.) *Partnership in Initial Teacher Training*. London: Cassell
- Wilkin, M. (1996) *Initial Teacher Training: The dialogue of ideology and culture*. London: Falmer
- Williams, A. and Soares, A. (2002) 'Sharing Roles and Responsibilities in Initial Teacher Training: Perceptions of some key players' *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 32 (1), pp. 91 – 107.
- Wilshaw, M. (2013) *Speech given at Church House, Westminster, on 20 June 2013 to launch the report Unseen children: educational access and achievement 20 years on*. [Online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/unseen-children> Accessed (05.04.16)
- Wilshaw, M. (2014) *Speech to the North of England Education Conference on 15th January*, [Online] Available at: <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20141124154759/http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/research/north-of-england-education-conference-2014-hmci-speech> (Accessed 02.01.15)
- Wilshaw, M. (2015) *Speech at the Future of Education Inspection launch on 15th June* [Online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/speech-at-the-future-of-education-inspection-launch> (Accessed: 18.06.15)
- Yin, R.K. (1994) *Case Study Research: Design and methods*. 2nd Ed. Thousand Oak: Sage